PUBLISHERS — LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Carswell Company
Limited
145-149 ADELAIDE STREET WEST
TORONTO

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
ONTARIO

106787

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
TORONTO
DEC 2 1953
RECEIVED

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
ONTARIO

ONTARIO

106787

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XVII

Friday, March 6, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

106787

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

106787

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M.C. Davies
Speaker.

- - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Friday, March 6, 1953.
2:00 o'clock p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: It is our pleasure today to welcome 233 students from the London Normal School, together with their Professors and Instructors. It is always a privilege for us to have those who are planning to dedicate their lives to the profession of teaching. We hope very sincerely that what you will gain here this afternoon you will be able to impart to those who will be under your care and instruction in the years to come. It is the wish of every hon. member of this Legislature that in your chosen profession you will render a fine service to the Province, to the country, and to all mankind.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Reports by Committees.

MR. ROBERT HERBERT (Temiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Mining and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Herbert from the Standing Committee on Mining, presents the Committee's first report as follows:

"Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

"Bill No. 72, An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act.

Bill No. 73, An Act to amend The Canada Company's Lands Act, 1922.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) A. R. Herbert,

Chairman."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney General) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Summary Convictions Act".

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are under a number of Provincial Statutes some offences where imprisonment is provided for without the Court having power to impose a fine in lieu of imprisonment. In many cases there may be a contravention

10672

which might be a technical breach, and even though there may be extenuating circumstances, the Court has no power to impose a fine rather than order imprisonment. This Bill provides that in all cases of that kind, the Court will have the option to impose a fine, rather than a sentence of imprisonment if it deems fit. This is included in almost all of the sentences of the Criminal Code.

Hon. Dana Porter (Attorney General) moved first reading of the Bill intituled, "The Credit Unions Act, 1953".

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill transfers from the Department of Agriculture to the Superintendent of Insurance the matter of administering Credit Unions.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): It is not a new Bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: There are certain provisions which have been included to give certain powers to the Superintendent. The Bill is also too bulky.

MR. THOMAS D. THOMAS (Ontario): Is that the only change?

HON. MR. PORTER: That is the major change. There are certain powers given to the Superintendent for inspections, and one thing and another. The Credit Unions have extended their activities in this Province, and the Department of Agriculture felt they did not have the staff to handle this particular type of business. It is a financial business

which is similar in many respects to other types of financial business, and the Superintendent of Insurance has facilities and the experience to deal with matters of this kind, and by agreement of the various departments concerned, it was decided this Bill should be introduced.

(Take B follows)

THE MEDICAL ACT

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health) moved first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Medical Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we passed a very similar Act last year, at which time we gave the privilege to internes in Class A hospitals, who are all graduates of universities, the right to write prescriptions for morphine, and, in fact, for all drugs within the hospital, and also the right to sign death certificates. This amendment simply adds that right in the case of D.V.A. hospitals or Her Majesty's hospitals, such as Sunnybrook and New Westminster.

ONTARIO SCHOOL TRUSTEES COUNCIL ACT

HON. W. J. DUNLOP (Minister of Education) moved first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend Ontario School Trustees Council Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are in the Province several different organizations of trustees, with somewhat different problems in each case. This Bill provides for the establishment and incorporation of The Ontario School Trustees Council, a body to

be made up of representatives appointed to this Council by the seven Associations. The general objects of the Council will be to promote and advance the cause of education and to provide a medium of communication to the Department of Education and to the Ontario Teachers' Federation regarding the views of member Associations on educational and administrative matters.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, it provides for the trustees exactly the same medium of communication as has been provided for the teachers of the Province.

PUBLIC SERVICES ACT

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary) moved first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Services Act."

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in three Sections. The first Section is designed to correct a situation, or a series of situations which have arisen in the past. That is, when a man leaves the Service for any reason, or if dismissed from the Service, compensation may be granted. If it is granted, it is computed by rule of thumb which is not fair in some cases, and in some cases it is

very much too generous.

The second reason for this Section pertains particularly to the pilots of the Department of Lands and Forests. Hon. members will realize this is more or less a young man's job, and the physical standards required are set by the Department of Transport at Ottawa; they are very rigid -- and rightly so. A good many of these men have been tried out in other administrative and technical jobs for which they were not trained, and in which they have not been successful, and have wished to leave the Service. It is felt that some provision should be made whereby they may be retired when their service as pilot is completed, if they do not wish to continue in the Service in some other capacity for which they are fitted.

The second Section will bring the Registrar of Deeds within the provisions of the Civil Service.

The third Section is a new formula for calculating service credits of teachers who transfer to the Public Service. The procedure is being simplified, and it will be very much more favourable than it has been in some cases in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.

Speaker, there are a few matters I should like to mention before the Orders of the Day. One of them I would not mention at this time if I did not consider it a matter of pressing public importance on which it is wise to remove any misunderstanding.

This is in relation to Bill No. 80, which is presently before the House. I noticed a brief comment relative to the employees of the various municipalities in this area, who feel, firstly, that the present Bill does not protect the rights of the employees. This matter will be explained as the debate on the Bill proceeds, but I think I should mention here, first of all, the question of superannuation, If an employee of one of the thirteen municipalities is taken over by the new body which is being formed, there is a feeling that there may be a loss of superannuation rights in that transfer, and that is not covered by the Bill.

The Department at the present time is considering a Section which will clarify that point.

In the last few years there have been several enactments permitting this. For instance, we have teachers who are contributing to the Superannuation Fund, and have become Civil Servants.

One case in point is Dr. Althouse, who is and has been a member of our Service for a number of years. Dr. Althouse's superannuation was transferred to the Public Service in the ordinary course. We now have reciprocal arrangements covered by statute concerning municipal employees, for instance, who are assimilated into Government Service. I think it goes so far as a transfer from the Federal Government to our Service.

These statutes are very broad, and we are satisfied they cover all of these points at the present time, but if there is any doubt on that point it will be taken care of by legislation which will not apply to the Toronto situation alone, but will clarify it across the board in Ontario. It would be general legislation, and not confined to Bill No. 80. I give that as one statement.

In regard to the other matter, in the Toronto situation I believe it is quite obvious that, first of all, all employees are protected by the municipal governments with and for which they presently work. Undoubtedly there are going to be transfers from the other Councils to the organization that will be set up, and I

would imagine these transfers would take place from the municipal organizations fromwhich they can be spared.

I have always said that I hoped this Bill would not increase taxation, and I hope that this area might get along with the employees who are presently employed. I cannot imagine there would be fewer employees; some people might argue that there be more, but I certainly think there will be a place for everybody.

In connection with the other matter about which I want to speak, it is a very great pleasure today to wish the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) many happy returns of the day on his forty-ninth birthday. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a very distinguished record in public service and in his service in this House. It is almost unbelievable to think, when you look at one so young as the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that he came to this House twenty-seven years ago, I believe, in the election of 1926.

I well remember at the time of his election noting in the Press that this young man was the youngest member ever to be elected to this House. That was something for the young people of my generation of twenty-six or twenty-seven years

ago to look forward to. It is unbelievable to that he has been here that length of time, nearly twenty-seven years.

In this House, of course, we have sometimes our points of difference, sometimes even points of very serious and severe controversy, but I believe all of us try to do a good job according to the best of our ability. I will say that about the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). I say that about him personally, and I say that about him as the Leader of his Party. In addition, I want to say concerning the hon. Leader of the Opposition that in my nearly sixteen years in this House I have invariably found him to be a gentleman.

I would like him to accept from all of us "Many Happy Returns of the Day."

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, may I be privileged to add a word to what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has so well said in congratulating my Leader. I know I am speaking from the depths of the hearts of all Liberal members in the House, and the Liberal adherents in the Province of Ontario, when I say to our Leader that we respect him for his ability, we admire him for his leadership, and we in the House

always receive inspiration from his leadership.

I want to say, too, we are honoured as members of this House to have his charming wife in the gallery. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) must be an easy man to live with, because his wife seems to grow younger as the days go by.

I know I am expressing the hopes of all hon. members on the Liberal side when I say we trust he will have a great many years of health and prosperity, and eventually, in the not too distant future, he will be able to lead our great Party down the path to victory.

MR. FARQUHAR R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and my colleague, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), for theirgood wishes on this day. As one grows older one rather hopes that the day will not be marked by any outward evidence that it is at hand, because these days come once a year and each one makes you feel that much older.

I am glad my wife is in the gallery this afternoon because there will be the evidence for her, at least, that sometimes the hon. members on the other side do say things about me that are nice,

and that I am not as bad as sometimes I am painted.

I fear as the days go on in this Session we will have wide differences of opinion; in fact, I promise the Government that we will have wide differences of opinion in the three or four weeks that remain.

The remark of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was very well put, that in spite of these wide differences of opinion, we are all endeavouring to do here what we believe is for the good of the people as a whole. We have that fundamental thinking and we subscribe to it. After all, if we did not have it and did not subscribe to it there would not be very much in political life.

I just want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate these remarks and I shall try and reciprocate in the days that lie ahead. Even though we differ widely, we can remember we have a common bond and that commong bond is that we love this Province, with each one of us contributing what we can towards its betterment.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) a question relating to the ferry service from Tobermory to South Bay Mouth.

Is the hon. Minister in a position to inform the House if there has been a change in the franchise? My information is that there is a change, either consummated or contemplated, which would give the franchise to a United States steamship company on a ten-year franchise basis, and I would like the hon. Minister to inform the House as to what the picture is in that respect.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition I would say that the franchise now is in the name of the Owen Sound Transportation Association. This licence or franchise was given in the year 1950 to the Owen Sound Transportation Association, and it runs for five years, which would include 1950 to 1954 inclusive.

As the hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows, this Company is subsidized by the Government at Ottawa, and our control is principally over leaving a port of Ontario and entering South Bay Mouth, I think it is a mile and a half between points, and we get a fee, as we do from all ferries. The Government does not contemplate cancelling or changing that contract, other than we have had a deputation from Manitoulin Island, accompanied by a representative of a

company in Detroit, inquiring about this. There has been a great deal of protest and a great deal of complaint regarding the service given by the present company, but I think we all realize that during the two vacation months it is very difficult for the one boat to transport the number of cars which come to this point to go across. The best the boat can do is three trips a day. We are interested in extending our co-operation to the Company which already has the licence, and to facilitate the accommodations to the many hundreds who go to this point during the two summer months. They say it is impossible for them to give further accommodation due to the very short season.

(C-1 follows)

The following Bills, upon motions, were given third reading.

Bill No. 66, "An Act for the Protection of Archeological and Historical Sites", Mr. Dunlop.

Bill No. 39, "An Act to Repeal the County Publicity Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Bill No. 40, "An Act to amend the Unemployment Relief Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

Bill No. 60, "An Act to amend the Chartered Accountants Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that these Bills do now pass and be intituled as in the motions.

ASSUMPTION COLLEGE

MR. ROBARTS (London), in the absence of Mr. Murdoch, moves second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting Assumption College".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

SOCIETE NATIONALE DE FIDUCIE

MR. BRANDON moves second reading of Bill No. 22, "An Act respecting Societe Nationale de Fiducie".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the

amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

HON. MACKINNON PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like again to pay tribute to your honourable self, as Speaker of this Legislature. I cannot add anything to what I said last year, except to say that your presence here is felt by each of us, whether sitting in Opposition or not. You deal fairly with all, and we all appreciate your efforts, and may I also say, your problems.

I want also to congratulate the hon. mover and seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I feel that in this session we have had excellent addresses from these two hon. members (Messrs. Nickle and Connell).

I also want to offer congratulations to the new members of the Cabinet and to our Deputy-Speaker of this year (Mr. Roberts), and to my own staff in the Department of Health. I can say sincerely to the hon. members of this House that more people in this great province of ours should know the amount of work which is entailed in each department, and just how loyal the departmental officials are to their Ministers and their departments, and being loyal to their Ministers, they are loyal to every person in this

great province of Ontario.

I want to pay tribute to the work they do. They are not on an eight-hour day; they may be, according to statute, but according to the number of hours they put in, it would be nearer ten or twelve.

I also want to join with the hon. Prime Minister in congratulating my good friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), and also to join with the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) for what he said, excepting I would like to make certain reservations, which I will not take the time to do at the present moment.

As far as the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I think he knows his riding is probably the second best in the province of Ontario. That may be debatable, and it might be disputed, but even though he and I have certain political differences, there are no better friends in this House than the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and the member for Grey North.

Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, there has been a certain amount of criticism levelled at this Government, levelled at the Cancer Foundation, and levelled at the Cancer Institute. May I say that those who have levelled this criticism do not know the facts. I desire, Mr. Speaker, that the first part

of my address today will be devoted to trying to explain to the hon. members in the House exactly what it means to construct an institute, which will be known as "The Ontario Institute", which will be situated at the Wellesley Division of the General Hospital, on that property, and I want to point out to the hon. members the vast amount of work and the number of problems with which they are faced, and I can assure the hon. members that those problems are not those of building an ordinary hospital.

This institute will be one of the most highly technical and highly professional hospitals of its kind in the whole world. It will have about 100 beds. It will have two Cobalt bombs. It will have all the other most modern professional equipment for the treatment of cancer as well as laboratories and a large research department.

I would like now to pay tribute to the work of the Ontario Cancer Research Foundation.

In the last few years, this Foundation has done a terrific job. They have established cancer clinics in Ottawa, Kingston, Hamilton, London, Windsor and Port Arthur. I have mentioned the names of those cities for one particular reason, and that is to show the hon. members that the Ontario Cancer Research Foundation did not put their first cancer clinic in

the city of Toronto, but they have placed them throughout the province, and I want to congratulate them very, very highly on the great work they have done.

I also want to pay tribute to the Ontario Institute which now has ready for approval by the Department of Health, plans for a great institute, for which sod will be broken probably sometime in May or June.

The best location seemed to be the property adjoining the Wellesley Division of the Toronto General Hospital. The space available was altogether too small, so we bought the Tuxedo Hotel, and it will be torn down. Within the last two or three weeks, we bought the property at 28 Wellesley Place, immediately adjacent -- with just a lane between -- for $28,000. This space will be used for the heating and power plants.

May I point out, Mr.Speaker, some of the basic problems with which the institute and the Cancer Foundation had to cope, before they could go ahead with their present plans? First of all, at Wellesley Hospital, there are seven nurses' residences. These could not be disposed of until a new residence was built. This residence is almost completed, and it has cost this Government -- which has paid in full for the residence -- one million, six hundred and some thousand dollars.

-- Mr. Mackenzie in the Chair.

They could not do away with the present heating or power plants, until they built a new one. They could not secure the two new large boilers until June, 1953, but now that they have acquired this new property on Wellesley Place, the project will be able to be proceeded with in June.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have in our estimates, $2 million for capital expenditures for this construction program and have had for the last two years. I am very happy to tell the hon. members of this House that that money will now be paid over to the Cancer Foundation before March 31st, next -- before the end of this fiscal year.

One other very important thing which has been decided by the Cancer Research Foundation and the Institute, is that this Institute will not be for the city of Toronto but it will be for the province of Ontario; it will be used equally by all hospitals within the metropolitan area, and the hospitals throughout Ontario will also have the same opportunity of sending patients here for highly specialized treatment, which will be necessary. One thing which has held up the program considerably, was the fact that the plant at Chalk River was damaged, but we have provided at the Sick Children's Hospital -- as a matter of fact, the installation is almost

completed -- for a Cobalt bomb. We hope to get that bomb in April. Of that, we are not quite sure, but we will have one by June.

I would now like to point out something about the criticism which is often levelled at the Department of Health, because we do not use up the money which the Federal Government is trying -- according to certain Press reports -- to shove into our hands. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of strings attached to certain Federal health grants, of which I will give you but one illustration this afternoon, and that is in connection with the Sick Children's Hospital where we are going to place a Cobalt bomb, until the new Institute is built. The bomb cost us about $50,000; the installation will cost about $30,000. We have been told that the Federal Government matches us "dollar for dollar". I would like to ask the hon. members this question: Here is a project which cost $80,000; how much did the Federal Government pay? Fifty percent. of the $50,000. or $25,000. What does this province pay? $25,000. plus the $30,000. cost of installation. The Federal Government will not pay one dollar towards capital construction, and therefore, out of the $80,000 the province of Ontario pays $55,000, the Federal Government pays $25,000, and I would like to ask the hon. members of this House if that is "dollar for dollar"?

I want the hon. members to bear these things in mind when levelling criticism at the Department of Health, stating that this Government is not using up these grants.

Only two or three years ago, I read in an editorial where we had only used up some 30 percent. or 40 percent. of the psychiatric grant. May I say to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, we have used over 100 percent. of the psychiatric grants and have made application to Ottawa for the transfer of funds from another vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word regarding cancer; We have a body known as the Cancer Foundation, which is the body which handles all the money, according to our Act, and we have handed them every dollar they have asked for, and practically all the grants have been on a"dollar-for-dollar basis".

In closing this part of my address, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. members to remember this has been a terrific task, and when anyone, whether the Press or the hon. members of this House, or another government -- that is, hon. members of the Opposition -- level criticism at what the hospitals are doing, or what the Cancer Foundation is doing, or what any other voluntary organization is doing, they are not criticising the Government; they are criticising the best public-

spirited citizens we have in Ontario, or, indeed, in Canada. These are the people who are giving their time, their efforts, and their business experience to serve on these Boards without any thought of remuneration.

Before dealing with another subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize to the hon. members of this House for making a statement the day I tabled the Health Survey Report, when I said the four Western provinces had only matched the Federal Government. That was 75 percent. true. It is true of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan, and of Alberta, but as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) said, British Columbia pays one-third.

(TAKE D FOLLOWS)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that you, being a Minister of the Gospel, or the Cloth, -- but the Minister of the Cloth is not in the Chamber at the moment, and it does not pay at any time in this Chamber to make an incorrect statement.

Most of us here are benedicts. We have been married, some of us, for quite some time, and after you are married for four or five years you learn that women have intuition, whatever that is. But we do know that it is a supernatural power with which we mere men cannot cope.

MR. D. THOMAS (Ontario): The Hon. Minister mentioned a statement he made when he presented the Report to the Legislature. I think if he will look at Hansard he will find that he said that the four Western provinces were paying less toward hospital construction than Ontario. I do not think he made any reference to the Federal government at that time.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr; Speaker, all I can say in reply to the hon. member is this: That I meant to say that the four Western provinces were not paying on the same basis as we were to public hospitals for hospital construction. Our grants on the whole run at least three dollars for every two dollars the Federal government pays and if I did not say it, what I meant was that the four Western provinces pay an exact amount equal to that which Federal government pays. My memory is still fairly

good and I certainly remember saying that it would save us a lot of headaches, and that is worth a great deal.

Coming back to the benedicts: there are a number, -- I do not know how many, -- I hope there are not more than three or four in the Chambers who are what I would call isolationists. They have not learned the facts of life. Mr. Speaker, I feel very sorry for them.

I would like to go back to British Columbia, I mean that in more ways than one. I am also sorry for British Columbia. I am sorry that the hon. member pointed it out, because, Mr. Speaker, I did my best when I was out west last November to find out just what this all-out socialized medicine was costing the Province of Saskatchewan, and what the deficit was. All I could find out was that over the four years they had it, the deficits had been mounting every year.

That is not British Columbia, and I am rather surprised that the hon. member did not use the province of Saskatchewan for comparison with Ontario.

MR. THOMAS D. THOMAS (Ontario): You know why?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I am going to tell why. First of all I am going to congratulate the Government of Saskatchewan for having enough common sense to start with the Pilot project of the Swift Current area which takes in 50,000 of inhabitants, which

is only one-sixteenth of their population. At the time they started the Pilot project they intended to go ahead and cover the whole province.

It is a good government but they did not go ahead. Why? On account of the cost.

Let us compare some of the figures, and I would like you to keep in mind the Blue Cross which has put forward a packaged policy for which they are charging the average family. I am just going to take the public-ward rate only.

The average family consists of a man, his wife, and children, and pay $5.70 per month, or $68.40 a year. That gives them hospitalization; it gives them all the services within the hospital; it gives them all medical and surgical care. As a matter of fact it is called "All Services In Hospital". Please keep the $68 a year in your mind.

Let us compare that with the Swift Current area. The province of Saskatchewan has it's hospitalization scheme across the whole province and they charge $30 a year for this, plus $35 a year for medical and surgical care, that is $65; plus 2.2 mills added to their municipal tax rate, plus 3 per cent sales tax. Part of this 3 per cent sales tax goes to education and part to this health scheme. In this, Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair and I want to say that I am

one hundred per cent in favour of a health insurance scheme, providing the people of this province, or the people of this great country known as Canada, can pay for it. I want to say one other thing. There is only one province of the ten which can afford it and that is Alberta. Why? Out of her one hundred million dollar revenue, forty million dollars of it is from one natural resource, oil.

It is my firm opinion that if we are going to have any naturalized health scheme, it should be paid out of our natural resources and not out of the pockets of the people. I would say at least 80 per cent should be from our natural resources.

MR. SALSBERG: Are you ready to tax nickle? We have a monopoly.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I might say to the hon. member that I am not the Minister of Mines. I try to look after the health of the people, and I might also say that I am not interested in nickle, silver or gold.

I would like for a moment to give you some suggestions of how it may be possible for us to reduce in the next few years, construction cost of hospitals. My officials and I have spent hours with architects and contractors, trying to work out ways and means whereby we can go ahead and construct some hospitals we can pay for, and anyone who criticizes the architect or the contractor, I ask him to remember that I

have had probably fifteen or twenty of them in my office and they are always willing to give their time and their efforts. They are always willing to say, "There is the material, if you want it." They have never refused to answer any questions I have asked them; in that, they have been most generous with their information, and I want to pay tribute to them, because they are just as anxious as we are to lower the price of construction.

Let us look at the rising construction costs since the war. In 1948 and 1949 construction costs went up between 20 and 22 per cent. In 1950 the increase was 15.3 per cent; in 1951, 8 per cent; in 1952 it was down to less than 1 per cent. It is most gratifying to know , at last it has levelled off; that no hospital board need accept a contract that has an escalator clause in it. But I want to say that we have to do better than that, because we are today living, as you know, in a new era. We are living in a state of inflation which I would not blame on anybody because these costs have gone up. It is simply in keeping with other things.

What are we going to do to reduce the costs? If we add up the figures, 64 per cent since 1947 has been quite a rise. As a matter of fact, I think that the index is something like 167, but that is only a guess.

The first thing that we have to consider

in the reduction of capital costs of new hospitals or new additions, is the brick and mortar. This is a hospital building only. Later we have to consider both professional equipment and non-professional equipment.

A great number of architects and contractors will give a quotation on the building, and their unit basis is either per square foot or per cubic foot. I might tell you that they always did like to quote . in cubic feet, because it reminded me of these dairy people. They sell their milk at so much a pint or so much a quart and they buy it from the farmers at so much a hundredweight and they simply confuse the whole issue. Here again is the same thing. They talk about "cubic feet" and unless you have a standard height for all your walls, they have you confused right from the start. So I have refused to talk with them on any other basis than the square-foot basis which I can understand.

MR. SALSBERG: Medically speaking square feet?

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: I think we can take this on any terms which the hon. member wishes, medically or otherwise.

The cost has been running lately in the smaller hospitals from 12 to 14 dollars per square foot. In larger hospitals the cost is from 16 to 18 dollars per square foot; on a cubic foot basis for the smaller

hospitals it is from $1.05 to $1 cubic foot, and on the larger from $1.20 to $1.40.

So you see how important it is to reduce the size of the building in order to save a number of square feet or a number of cubic feet.

Let us consider the bed room itself. A hospital bed is six feet four inches long. We allow three inches at the head end and we allow five inches at the foot, which will give us from the middle of one wall to the middle of the next, 12 feet. We feel that that is sufficient and is the optimum. If you go into hospitals today you will find the space is from fifteen to seventeen feet. Here you could save three to five feet.

The next important point is to simply take a leaf from the book of Henry Ford. What he did was implement standardization and repetition. Have one room after another the same, right down the line, and if you have twenty rooms, you are going to cut off one hundred feet at five feet per room.

Regarding the corridors. No corridar needs to be wider than eight feet. Today they are nine and ten feet. Here again we can take one to two feet off the whole width of your hospital. Then we will come to the height of the ceilings. We feel that the height from the floor to the ceiling need not be more than nine feet eight inches, and in corridors not more than eight feet. You

may ask, "What are you going to do with the extra space in the ceiling?" Let me say to the hon. members that we are making progress today, and you know, in every field, whether it is mechanical, scientific, professional, or any other, as do we, that a larger space in the ceiling of corridors is required to carry the air vents, hot and cold, the vents from the toilets and the washrooms, the electrical equipment, the plumbing equipment, to carry oxygen to every room, to carry the apparatus for suction from every room, and also leave plenty of space for anything which comes in, in the next few years, and would leave plenty of space for a workman to crawl along and put in any new facilities, or else repair any obsolete facilities. At the best, plumbing equipment and electrical equipment, will only last for thirty to forty per cent of the length of time of the rest of the equipment.

I am just going to deal with one more thing in this field and that is the site, how we should build these hospitals, the size of the grounds. I realize that we have to have a group of hospitals in the central part of Ontario to work with the university, but I would like to see more hospitals built in the suburban areas like the northwestern hospital, where we have a concentration of people as well. We should acquire at least eight acres of ground.

Regarding our general construction program:

The trend today is toward the horizontal rather than the vertical plan because architects are beginning to realize that hospitals built on the horizontal rather than the vertical plan, enable them to reduce the cost from ten thousand to twelve thousand per bed or even down to seven thousand or nine thousand dollars per bed.

Now what about the maintenance cost of our hospitals? The first item I would like to tie in with the capital cost, is flooring. Lineoleum is all right, and it is much cheaper than Terrazzo floors; in fact it is 30 to 35 per cent cheaper, but, Mr. Speaker, it is not cheaper in the long run for the simple reason that it lasts, you might say, for all time. The maintenance and the operating care of it, is very much reduced. The Terrazzo floors can be washed down or mopped, while linoleum floors require a great deal more labour in waxing, etc.

(Take E follows)

Your Hospital Board may say, "We cannot afford it." I will tell them how they can save the money so they can afford it. Forget about those ceramic tiles in the operating room, the washrooms, and so on; put on six or seven coats of enamel paint and this will save enough so they can put in terrazzo floors when the hospital is built, and in a few years they can add the tile when they can afford it.

The next thing regarding maintenance is staff. While I was out West, I was told in both British Columbia and Alberta that the cost of labour was 70 per cent, which includes both professional and non-professional. Maintenance costs have gone up at a rapid rate; more so than construction costs. In 1946 the average cost per bed-day was $5.50; in 1951 it was $10.50. We have not the figures for 1952, but it will be $11.50 or $11.75. I certainly am hoping it will not reach $12. Seventy per cent of this was labour costs in British Columbia and Alberta. Here in Ontario in "A" hospitals it amounts to 60-65 per cent; "B" hospitals, 55-60 per cent; "C" hospitals, 50-55 per cent.

When we look at the ratio of the number of

staff per bed we find it runs from 1.1 to 1.5, with an average of about 1.3. I attended the last executive meeting of the Ontario Hospital Association, and asked if they could find ways and means to reduce the ratio of staff to bed to 0.9, and that is about what we shall have to do if we are going to maintain our hospitals.

The only other thing is centralization of services, and we are hopingthat can be done. We made a sort of pilot project where three hospitals will have one common laundry, the construction of which will cost $6 million, but if each one of them had built, the total of the three would have been $9 million, so we are saving one-third on construction. The estimate of saving in maintenance is about the same, probably a little more.

Mr. Speaker, today I have not been dictatorial. In the last three parts of my address I have been giving to hon. members of this House suggestions which I would like them to think over and talk over with their own architects, and if they have any suggestions to offer the Department of Health -- whether the suggestions come from the Opposition or from the Government members -- we shall be glad to receive them,

and if they have merit we shall certainly use them.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), but I remember when he presented the report of the Ontario Health Survey on Wednesday he referred to it very briefly at that time, and this afternoon he was even more brief. I am very much surprised, because he did call that "a document of great importance," which entailed a tremendous amount of labour and effort and money, and I would like to know if he would care to elaborate on the Ontario Health Survey in respect to some of the recommendations which were made. He has not made any mention of it this afternoon.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I regret having to make this statement, but it is true. This Government cannot be blamed for it, nor should anyone be blamed for it, but the Health Survey Report which I tabled the other day was based on health services in Ontario in 1948, and we have made so many progressive advances since that time that it is almost an impossibility for me to take that as a basis for any address which

I might make. If the hon. members wish it I shall be only too glad to tell them about the progress, of which we are very proud.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I might remind the hon. Minister of Health that the report was presented to the Government in October, 1950, according to the report itself.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: No matter when it was given to us, it was under the control of the Minister of Health and Welfare at Ottawa, and since they paid for the project they are the ones who call the tune, and they were the ones who released the report to the Province of Ontario. That report was released immediately on advice from the Federal Government at Ottawa.

HON. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): The point is that the Federal Government re-released it, and as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) was in the House last year; he knows all about it. We would have liked to release it a long time before, but they asked us not to release it until all the reports were received from across Canada, and it was released on instructions from the Ministry at Ottawa.

HON. MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I tabled two letters last year in the Legislature. The

first one requested me to hold it, and the second one asked me to table it, and it was tabled.

MR. THOMAS PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile), I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 80, "An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area, for certain financial and other purposes."

--- Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks on Bill No. 80, I would like, with your permission, to say a few words about the passing of Joseph Stalin, Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and one of the greatest personalities of our time.

His death is a severe loss to the peoples who make up the Soviet Union, to all who strive for a peaceful world and to hundreds of millions of workers and farmers throughout the world who aspire to attain a free Socialist society in which exploitation of man by man and strife between peoples will forever be ended.

Stalin combined within himself various gifts of unusual greatness. His leadership qualities are exemplified by the major role he played in the transformation of an industrially backward country into one of the most advanced states in the world. His military genius was universally acknowledged in the unforgettable struggle which the Soviet Army and people carried on under his leadership as our allies against the Nazi hordes. His theoretical works rank him as one of the foremost thinkers of our time.

Only a few short years ago the portrait of Stalin, together with those of the late President Roosevelt and of Prime Minister Churchill, adorned all government buildings and all public places of our country and of all freedom-loving countries, as symbols of the united struggle against Naziism and Fascism. I am confident that the calumnies which have been directed for so long against Stalin will, as time goes on, sink into oblivion and the figure of Stalin will emerge and remain in history as one of the greatest among the great of all times.

In conclusion I want to express my sincere hope that Stalin's repeated declaration of the possibility and need for the peaceful co-existence between the socialist and non-socialist sectors of the world will become the guiding policy of Canada and of all states. It is in the acceptance of this basic policy of peaceful co-existence that we can find the only road to lasting peace, friendship and co-operation between the peoples and states of the world. /

Now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the living. I would like to join with those who congratulated the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) on his birthday. This is one time when I was

caught unawares, and before I could say anything about it the hon. Leader of the Opposition was on his feet. I,too,join in wishing him long and active years of service. I hope he will see the light that some of us have and will thereby be strengthened in his work and enabled to make a much better contribution than he is trying to make.

I agree with all the remarks about his sincerity, and devotion. I was glad, although I sympathized with him in a measure, when he sold his family farm, but I was happy he had done so because it will enable him to devote himself more fully to the work of the Official Opposition.

I assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that in every effort of his and his group to bring about improvements for the people, he can count on my support.

Yesterday afternoon I was dealing with a question which caused a great deal of uneasiness across the way. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has already mentioned it in his remarks before the Orders of the Day, and I just want to touch on it for a moment before continuing.

It is in regard to municipal employees.

I am sorry that my remarks yesterday caused hon. members of the Government to jump up and protest, but what I said about the failure of the Government to include in this Bill provisions for the protection of the municipal employees is evidently shared by the unions of the municipal employees.

I see also by the newspapers that the Trades and Labour Council at a meeting last night used words almost the same as I used in the House. I hope the Government will meet with the representatives of those unions. I notice that the Trades and Labour Council is calling a meeting with the head of the Civic Employees Union to deal with this question, and I hope the Government will meet with them and agree to bring in recommendations or amendments to the Bill which will satisfy their needs.

Hon. members will recall that yesterday I was dealing with the question of taxation, and was basing my remarks on statements of authoritative people, that unless the Government takes over the financial responsibility for certain services, among which is education, the taxes of the home-owners in the Greater Toronto Area will rise, regardless of any statements to the contrary.

(F-1 follows)

but I might say, Mr. Speaker, that education constitutes one of the most expensive items, not only in capital costs for new schools, but also in the operation of our schools. While I do not agree with the policy of cutting out the so-called "frills", as I do not consider a gymnasium as a "frill". I think they are necessary for the development of our children, I think the schools should be as attractive and as comfortable as it is humanly possible to make them, so they will become the centres to which children want to go, rather than have them hanging around the street corners. Leaving aside, the question of "frills", the cost of education is so high, it constitutes the main threat to the financial stability of some of the suburban areas, and yet in most respects, this Government has not provided for any relief to the municipalities concerned, insofar as the educational costs are concerned. If that is going to be the policy of the Government, then the Bill before us cannot but lead to increased taxation for all the residents of this great area.

I do not agree with the minimum standards established by the Bill. In my opinion, this minimum standard of $150. per year per child, established for elementary schools, is insufficient, and may endanger the standards already established in an area such as

Toronto proper. When I say this, Mr. Speaker, I am only repeating what members of the Board of Education have said at their own meetings, when this problem was discussed, and I was there as an observer. There is the danger that the level of education will be reduced, and the arbitrary figure fixed by the Government, in this Bill, is endangering the accomplishment of the more advanced and more prosperous communities in the Greater Toronto area, and should not be included there.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a single important welfare service taken over by the province, which would really relieve the municipalities, whether it be Scarborough, Toronto, Etobicoke or York. You cannot by mixing it all up, come to any other conclusion but by their failure to do this, costs are bound to rise, and taxes rise accordingly. One of the odd situations which has arisen is that Toronto, with its most modern, up-to-date and expensive water system, will have to buy water from the Greater Toronto area. Just imagine Toronto buying water. That is like carrying coals to Newcastle. The water rates will rise, I have no doubt about that. And I am predicting it with confidence, although I wish it were otherwise.

The same is true in connection with our transportation costs. There is no doubt that the

transportation costs will rise. I have here a statement by the Chairman of the Toronto Transportation Commission, in which he leaves no doubt whatsoever on that score. I am quoting from the Toronto Star of January 22nd, 1953. The heading of the story is: "Cummings Report means 10¢ Fare in Year, McBrien".

An hon. member has said that we are not discussing the Cumming Report, but I suggest to the hon. member, and to the entire House, that while it is true we are not discussing the Cumming Report, the Bill contains all the essential features of the Report, certainly insofar as the transportation problem is concerned, and Mr. McBrien, who is the Chairman of The Toronto Transportation Commission, has no hesitation in predicting that this will result in a 10¢ fare. That was also the opinion of others, but I do not wish to trouble the House by quoting them today. I will be glad to pass them to any hon. member who desires to read them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word about suburban home owners. There is an impression created in some of the suburban areas that the unification will lead them out of difficulty, and Toronto the Rich will pay for all the improvements. That, of course, is far from a fact, and from the reality. Those in the suburban areas will be extremely hard pressed. First of all,

they bought homes at extremely high prices; they are in many cases heavily mortgaged; in fact, some white-collared people have referred to their own areas as "Mortgage Manor", or some other appelation. The white-collared people owning these homes purchased at high prices cannot help but be faced with heavy mortgages.

They, too, will have their taxes increased, and it is inescapable that they, too, will find the burden of taxation increased if all those things they expect or think they are entitled to, are brought about. You cannot put in water mains and sewage disposal equipment and plants, you cannot pave streets, even though you spread it about, without increasing the taxation. You cannot do it unless the province takes over at least part of the load. It is as simple as that. I do not think they will be relieved in any way, as they have been led to believe.

Insofar as the city of Toronto is concerned, -- and, Mr. Speaker, I am not taking a parochial approach, -- I want to ask the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts), whose riding is next to mine, what this will mean to the people on McCaul Street, on Beverley Street, and St. George Street, on Bernard Avenue, Huron Street and Spadina Road, the main streets of his constituency? What will it mean to

the home owners there? It will mean increased home taxation. There is no doubt about it, without, of course, any return.

What will it mean in my own constituency? What will it mean on Huron Street, Robert Street, Major Street, Borden, Bathurst, and Markham Streets? There we have the working people owning their small homes, and their taxes are very high, and are bound to be increased without any return or any compensation by way of any improvement in services, except perhaps higher water rates and higher streetcar fares. What will it mean to the working people who constitute the main portion of the population in the adjoining riding to the west, the riding of Bellwoods.

MR. YAREMKO:(Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member asking a rhetorical question or a direct question?

MR. SALSBERG: I am asking a rhetorical question, which the hon. member (Mr. Yaremko) may answer when he is ready. I am asking questions which I think are very important. What will it mean to the people on Bellwoods, Euclid, and all the other streets? They constitute the working-class areas, particularly from the beginning of the Hill section down. Their taxes are almost prohibitive now. All they will get

as a result of this legislation is an increase in their tax bills, an increase in their water bills, and increased streetcar fares. May I say to the hon. member representing the riding of Bellwoods, or, in fact, any of these ridings, if the hon. member from any riding wants to discuss this problem in their own constituency, or mine, I will welcome any opportunity to discuss it. I will go with the hon. member for Bellwoods to his riding, and he is welcome to come into mine. I will go with the hon. member for St. Patrick and let the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) come into mine. I can assure you, you will have difficulty convincing the people that they are going to benefit from this Bill. These people are the best and most charitable people you can find anywhere. Let us not mislead them into some belief that they will suddenly find their taxes cut, that the city will grow and expand according to the plans of the Government, and that all will be well. All will not be well. We should face these facts, Mr. Speaker. There was one remark made by the hon. Prime Minister which I know he did not mean in the way it sounded, and that was when he said, when questioned by representatives of the newspapers, that "Toronto will grow into the air . The rest of

the area will grow horizontally; but Toronto will go up into the air" -- in other words, it is going to build up. That is what the hon. Premier said the future will hold for the city of Toronto proper. And may I say to the hon. members representing ridings in Toronto, lest they think I have singled out St. Patrick and Bellwoods, that what I have said applies to Riverdale, to Beaches, to Parkdale, in fact, to all the ridings.

There was talk for a while about overcoming some of these difficulties. It serves no useful purpose for hon. members to rise in their places and say, "Well, we have it; what do you suggest?". I will suggest, before I resume my seat, and deal with each separate item. But it is wrong to shut one's eyes to the fact that a large number of people of this city, and outside, are aware of the problems I have presented yesterday and today. Unless this Government does something, higher taxes and higher service costs are inevitable. Let me remind the hon. members, when the Report was issued, the newspapers of this city speculated and published reports to the effect that the province is planning to make a grant of about $20 million to the unified area, as a help. The commentators in the Press, the reporters and the writers, admitted that unless something was done,

higher taxes were inevitable.

In the Star of the 23rd of January, 1953, over the name of Lee Belland, appears the heading;

> "Grant of $20,000,000 New Tax Base Seen Frost Plan for City".

In other words, that the $20 million grants would provide a new tax base for the city.

The Telegram of the 10th of January, 1953, in an editorial by Mr. John Cranford, under the heading, "Queen's Park Expected to Compromise in its Final Say on Cumming Report", said as follows:

> "However, he is prepared to insist - -'

--speaking of the Mayor --

> "--that Toronto be given some assurance that it won't be necessary for Toronto taxpayers to pay to bring services in other municipalities up to their own level. He has suggested that this could be achieved by creation of a special Provincial fund. And, as yet, there has been no proof that such a fund might not be possible. Rather, there have been suggestions that the Province will earmark a considerable sum -- one report went as high as $20,000,000 -- to help implement the Report."

He suggested this could be achieved by provincial funds, but as yet there is no evidence of such a fund.

You see, the people were led to believe

that some such large grant would be made in order to cushion the shock of the large capital expenditure which are bound to be made once this new set-up comes into being. But the Bill does not provide for such a grant. That is the fact. The Bill provides no large nest-egg for the Greater Toronto area. It does nothing of the sort. It provides, it is true, for what has now become known as the "grants without strings", but it is a very small amount; it makes a mountain out of a mole-hill, as I said yesterday. It is only a hand-out to all the municipalities who have been asking for assistance, and who are not going to be confronted with the colossal capital outlay, with which this area will be confronted. It can hardly be considered as assistance of any special sort to this Greater Toronto area which will be confronted with problems of a special nature. There is no question that the assets of Toronto will be taken over, and we will "pay the shot", the same as everyone else. I am not one of those who begrudge the extention of services we have built up, to another part of the area, but I am very realistic about this, as I think we all must be, and I think it is too bad this Government did not set aside in the Bill, some provision for a large grant of this character. There

is no provision for the Government to take over the larger share of the costs of education, or capital costs for the new educational program we will be obliged to inaugurate, and which will be essential, and there will be nothing but increases in taxation, whether it is in one riding or another in this Greater Toronto area.

I said something yesterday about tax exemptions, and I am sorry to say that this Bill does not provide anything for them. I do not want to belabour it or elaborate on it today, but there is nothing in the Bill to ensure that tax exemptions, which are so important to the most deserving sections of home owners, will be retained, extended and widened to govern the entire metropolitan area. In my opinion, theyshould be extended, and there should be a 50 percent. exemption for homes assessed up to $4,000 or less, and graduated up to / $6,000. I am told it rests with the municipalities how they will define the limited right of the respective municipalities in other matters, in a negative way. Why do we not assure them in a positive manner that theywill not be abolished? I think it is a very progressive and essential reform introduced at the time of the Drury Government, and Toronto is one of the municipalities which has availed itself of that legislation, and applied it to this city. It helps

the workers who own little cottages which are assessed at $2,000 or $3,000 or even $1,500. Before the inflation of these assessments, there were plenty of homes owned by modest owners in this town, which could not be retained without the exemption.

Mr. Speaker, there is one point with which I have already dealt, but which I wish to elaborate upon considerably, although I will be brief in doing so. I am repeating this only because, unfortunately, from my point of view, the Press, by and large, in the reports which were made of my points of view, did not refer to it, but in my opinion, it is of prime importance. I refer to the guarantee of the right to the citizens of the entire area to voice any opinion before any agreement -- this or any other -- is put into operation. You cannot introduce democratically, any agreement, without asking the people what to do. I was asked yesterday by one of the hon.members whether there was a plebiscite when Confederation was brought about, If I had been here at that time, Mr. Speaker, I would have asked the people be given the right to vote on that question. But I was not here. If any hon.members were here, they would have also insisted, but they were not here either, so we are on equal terms on that.

I say it is undemocratic not to go to the people and tell them "this is the plan, what is your opinion?". Why should they not vote? Why be afraid of the people? Why not trust them? I am quite willing to take a chance on the outcome of a vote taken in the riding from which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) comes, and I have faith that the people will make a proper decision. But whatever decision they may make, that is their right, and they should be given the opportunity to express their opinion before they are saddled with one agreement or another, and this agreement, in my opinion, works adversely to the common interest. Other hon. members may say that they know the feelings in their constituencies. One hon. member said, "This is a red letter day". He has a right to his opinions, as I have a right to mine, but I doubt if even in his own riding, the home owners will agree that this is a "red letter day".

(TAKE G FOLLOWS)

But let us find out. Let them vote. I might say that the Toronto Star in the past, when dealing with the question of Toronto amalgamation, insisted that the people be given the vote, and I hope that that newspaper will continue to ask for a vote to be given to the people before any scheme will be adopted.

I have here an editorial from the Toronto Star. I am not going to read it because I promised to try to abbreviate my talk. It is dated January 31st, 1950, when the matter first came up. The Star editorial of that date says, among other things:

> "And there is the question of plebiscites. Should the people of a municipal unit have no choice as to whether they will join forces with those of other municipalities? The idea is not democratic. Undoubtedly the legislature has the power to compel, but it is not a power which ought to be exercised. There is no justification for 'drafting', for municipal conscription, for a shot-gun municipal wedding."

That is exactly what this will mean unless we provide in the Bill for a plebiscite or referendum of the people. This government will show people their fear and distrust of those people if they refuse to incorporate an amendment to the Bill.

MR. ROBERT MACAULAY (Riverdale): I wonder if the hon. member will permit me to ask a question?

MR. SALSBERG: Of course.

MR. MACAULAY: I wonder if you would be good enough to tell us this: If this was put to the people

and some of the people liked half of it and did not like the other half, and other people liked half of it, and half the municipalities liked it and the other half did not, what conclusive results would you get? If it were defeated, you would have to leave the matter and have another type of Bill. How long would it be before my hon. friend envisages one million one hundred thousand people agreeing upon the terms of the same Bill?

MR. SALSBERG: I have confidence that the people, if given the opportunity, make a very wise choice. If there should be disagreement between one municipality and another, it would simply mean that this government should try to bring the municipalities together for another conference and another discussion, to try and arrive at a compromise which would be acceptable, which is the only way to handle it. Otherwise you are going to decide that this Government has all the wisdom in the world.

If a member of the suburbs decided against it, and others decided for it, you say it will take a long time. I don't think it will not if this Government wants to act. There are matters upon which the Government has shown great speed, and others upon which it has shown a sleepiness and inaction that is really amazing.

MR. MACAULAY: How would you vote if you liked half the Bill?

MR. SALSBERG: Let this House decide when I should be given the power to bring this about in a democratic fashion. Then it would be brought about to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the people of this province. This plan is undemocratic. Besides that I say, whatever the plan, before enforcing it let the people vote on it. I think that is sound. Nothing else is sound.

One word on the question of the secondhand Government that I spoke of. This is a very undemocratic proposal. I am only adding a few remarks to this question, about which I have already spoken at the beginning. It is extremely undemocratic to hand over taxation powers to a government which is not even elected. It is tantamount to taxation without representation. It means giving this power to a council that is not directly elected, but many of whom may be there by sheer accident, because in a ward in Toronto, by some sheer accident the size of the family of one candidate as against another may make the difference of fifteen votes. That may make one man senior and the other junior. Therefore the senior goes on the greater Toronto council.

I say it is particularly wrong to have a secondhand Council, an accidental Council, which will have taxing powers to undertake important

public works which may run to millions of dollars in two years. We are not dealing with only a few thousand dollars. We are dealing with matters that run to tens of millions of dollars. The opening of new streets will be handed over to the new Council, and you can have a quorum of seven, which means four people may decide upon the undertaking of something that will involve expenditures of millions of dollars.

In addition to that you deny the people the right to vote on capital expenditures. The hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) told me after last night's hub-bub --

MR. MACAULAY: He told you publicly, too.

MR. SALSBERG: I assumed you would not question my repeating his remark. He said that that is only for a short period. Later on, the Council may change that, but I say in that period they will be empowered by this legislation to undertake tremendous projects which, like broken eggs, can never be unscrambled.

There is another matter which the hon. members should take into account, those hon. members who have been at any time members of the Toronto Council. They should realize the duties and tasks of the members of the Toronto Council have been increasing year by year. Controllers are working full-time; the mayor occupies a full-time position and Aldermen are giving more and more of their time. I say to you it is

physically impossible to have the set-up that is proposed where a senior alderman from the Toronto Council will also be a member of the Metropolitan Council, and will be able to do justice to both jobs. I assure you, Mr.Speaker, that every member who has ever been a member of the Toronto Council will agree that it is physically impossible.

MR. MACAULAY: What about the hon. member from Windsor, is he not in both capacities? It cannot be a physical impossibility; he is doing it.

MR. SALSBERG: He will give you an answer. It is not my job here.

The law provides that no member of this Legislature can be a member of the Federal government, you cannot even run for it before you resign. Even the hon. member, our friend from Niagara (Mr. Houck) according to the newspapers is obliged to resign before he can become an official candidate in another election. The law at present makes that ruling, and you are going to mix it up in this Council, if a city alderman is also going to be a metropolitan Council alderman. He will be unable to do the job. You will have two levels of governments mixed, and the body which will have large taxing powers will not be elected. I say there is something wrong.

How can the Mayor of Toronto be a member .. of the Toronto Council, and also be a member of the

Metropolitan Council?

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Stewart) has been an alderman and knows what demands are put upon the Council. How can they assume the task of the Metropolitan Council in addition to what they are already doing? It is impossible to do it, especially in the first two years, impossible for any Reeve, impossible for any Alderman to do that.

I think we should approach this in a very reasonable and democratic fashion.

I think we should elect the members of the Metropolitan Council, if we are going to have one, after the people have approved it, and have people directly elected to that job.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Do you think amalgamation will be democratic?

MR. SALSBERG: I am not one of those who has turned to amalgamation, and amalgamation only, as the only solution. I think it is necessary, if we want to do the right thing, to have this legislation amended so that we have a Metropolitan mayor if we are going to have a Metropolitan area, a Metropolitan Board of Control for whom the people in the area will vote. That will be their job. I think that every ward here should elect two members to the Metropolitan Council to be designated as Metropolitan aldermen. That will leave eighteen; then let the other municipalities be given an equally proportionate number. Let them have

eighteen, so that each area will elect their direct representatives, controllers and mayor, voted for by the entire city. That is not an unwieldy Council, and they at least will be elected by the people directly for whom they will have to serve.

I hope that even such a Council would not take away from the people the right to vote on money bills. That is unheard of.

I hope this House will not accede to this Bill, providing that the people in this great area be not allowed to vore on money bills when hundreds of millions of dollars are involved. I think the aldermen should be elected as are Toronto aldermen, and they will do a job for their constituents in their area.

I am about to conclude. Before doing so I have a few more remarks to make. I want to say that the hon members of this House last night were a little bit warmed up about the speech I made.

It is not easy to stand on your feet for three hours and speak and be heckled and interrupted, and questioned. It is much easier to sit back and heckle someone else, and if any hon. member did not like it, he could have walked out. It is his right to walk out if he wants to.

I would like to say I have no apology to make to this House nor to anyone, for having taken the time I did yesterday and the time I am taking

today, and I do hope that no hon. member will be "peeved" about it, or resentful. I said I took up so much time, but I did not take enough, because there are many points I did not cover.

(Take H follows)

But I took the minimum of time I considered necessary to elaborate on what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) correctly labels as the most important piece of legislation to come before us in a hundred years. There have been speeches made in this House on Bills affecting one institution that lasted for seven and eight hours, made by one hon. member, and I believe he was justified in doing what he did. That was a Bill dealing with one matter, and the hon. member on that occasion spoke for seven and one-half hours.

I have been advised by hon. members who are reading at the moment -- something I also intend to do when I have more time -- that during the Debates on Confederation, someone rose in the Legislature and spoke for two and a half days.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who made the remark that I will have lots of time after the next election, implies, obviously, that I may be defeated. May I repeat what I said yesterday on this very question, that important as a seat in this Legislature is -- and it is important -- and desirable as it may be, it is far more important to stand up here or anywhere else defending what one believes in, advocating what one is convinced of, and telling the truth at all

times. If that means the loss of a seat, then the loss is secondary and is only temporary, I assure the hon. member. I have been defeated before and I will be defeated again, but I have the right to speak and to say what I believe, and I appreciate particularly, Mr. Speaker, your own personal consideration.

The press reports would indicate that there was something between us yesterday. There was not. I think, Mr. Speaker, under pressure of hon. members and the atmosphere generally, rose to his feet to draw my attention to the need of adhering to the principle of the Bill. I felt at all times that I was doing so; if I was not, Mr. Speaker, I assure you again it was unintentional, and I was unaware of it. If at any time I departed from the principle of the Bill, it was not my desire and not my intention.

To hon. members may I say again -- not by way of apology, but because I think it is necessary that it be repeated -- that when I argue with the Government or with hon. members, it is not a personal battle, it is a battle over principles, over important issues. Sometimes in the heat of battle things are said and words are uttered, which upon reflection I am sure everybody feels

could have been phrased differently or kept to one's self. However, that is human, and as far as I am concerned I assure all those who may have participated and got a little "kick" out of heckling, I do not hold it against them at all.

May I, Mr. Speaker, conclude by providing in a more co-ordinated form the suggestions I made in the discussions yesterday and today as to my proposals for the solution of the problem. I think by now the hon. members who listened know that my main emphasis was on Government assumption of responsibility, financial responsibility for services which the municipalities now carry -- a re-allocation of responsibility. Without that the plan does not accomplish what the people anticipate.

I shall, Mr. Speaker, sum up by saying that I propose the following as a just and progressive unification program for the Greater Toronto Area.

1. The Provincial Government to relieve the thirteen municipalities -- as well as all municipalities in the Province -- of hospital costs, welfare and relief expenditures, provide 50 per cent of the cost of education as promised by the Government, and make an outright grant of at least $30 million towards the capital

costs of new school construction and the enlargement of other essential services.

2. A plebiscite or referendum to be held throughout the thirteen municipalities to give the citizens the opportunity to vote on this or any other unification scheme before it will be put into effect.

3. A Metropolitan Council to consist of directly elected representatives only. The Metropolitan Council to consist of two directly elected Metropolitan aldermen from each Ward, a proportionate number (18) to be elected by the voters in the other twelve municipalities and a Metropolitan Mayor and Board of Control of four to be elected by the voters of the entire Metropolitan Area. This will provide a directly elected Metropolitan Council of forty-three.

No taxation power to be given to any but a directly elected Metropolitan Council.

The Mayor, Board of Control and Alderman for the City of Toronto and the Reeves and Councillors of the suburban municipalities to be elected on a separate ballot on the same election day.

4. The Partial Tax Exemption on homes now in operation in Toronto to be guaranteed and extended throughout the Metropolitan Area and the exemption to start with 50 per cent exemption for homes assessed at $4,000 or less, and to be graduated up to $6,000.

5. A comprehensive public low-rental housing scheme to be incorporated as part of the unification plan.

6. Low interest second mortgages and the extension of the amortizing period from 20 to 30 years to be provided for so as to enable low income families to acquire their own homes.

7. The Municipal Franchise to be extended to provide for all who have a right to vote in provincial elections to also vote in municipal elections.

8. The right and the need for voting on money by-laws to be incorporated in any unification scheme.

9. The rights and interests of the municipal employees of all affected municipalities to be guaranteed in the Bill.

On the question of finances, Mr. Speaker, I could give the Government very simple directions. What I propose will cost money, yes, but I say

this Government and the Federal Government have sources of taxation that are not open to municipalities, and in the face of mounting taxes they should assume the load. There is no difficulty in their finding the money. In the first instance there are enormous surpluses of this Government which could be put to use for supporting the unification scheme along the lines I suggest. Last year it was about $28 million.

Second, I believe this Government should get together with the Federal Government with regard to their sharing some of the costs of the services that I suggest should be taken over from the municipalities.

Third, I think negotiations should be opened againw with the Dominion Government for returning the right to the Province to levy a corporation income tax, which would provide all the money required for the financing of these projects.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that we already have a five-year program with Ottawa. May I inform hon. members I know that, but may I tell them also that I suggested a year, two years, three and four years ago that we should have a right to levy such a tax, and I pointed out at the time

the increase would be more than sufficient to carry on.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that such a just and progressive program of unification will enable this City to grow into a city of homes and to play a leading role in this leading Province in the growth and expansion of a great and independent country.

MR. THOMAS PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts), I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, and in so doing, may I say for the information of hon. members that we shall proceed with the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne on Monday, and also with the debate on Bill No. 80.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.31 of the clock p.m.

- - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XVIII

Monday, March 9, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M.C.Davies

Speaker.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, March 9, 1953.
3:00 o'clock p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Today it is our pleasure to have students from the Bedford Park School and also students from Loretto College School. We are very happy indeed to welcome the students from these two schools to our Session this afternoon.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. M. Phillips (Minister of Health) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act."

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, with the permission of

the House I would like this Bill to go before the Health Committee and give a full explanation of it on the second reading.

Hon. Charles Daley (Minister of Labour) moved first reading of a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act."

Motion agreed to, first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these two amendments to the Act are section 1, subsection 3, and section 13. The Act at present requires plans in respect to the construction of buildings to be used as factories, etc., to be submitted to the Chief Inspector who is required to examine and approve them.

The amendments are to clarify the procedure and to provide for the collection of fees. The second amendment has to do with the employment of women during hours not now specified under the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act. What this amendment will do, is give some premissive discretionary power to the minister to permit the employment of women during hours other than those specified in the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act.

Mr. JOSEPH SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Does this come before the Labour Committee?

HON. MR. DALEY: I see no reason why it should not, although I had not thought of this particular Bill going there.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. BRYAN L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the privilege of placing on the desk of each member of this House a copy of the Annual Progress edition of our local paper, The Canadian Observer, Sarnia, Ontario, While you will note that the edition comprises some 106 pages, it still can only give you the highlights of the great development taking place in Sarnia and Lambton County. May I take this moment to pay tribute to the management and personnel of our Canadian Observer in providing us with this splendid edition. It is my hope that each member of this House will take the time to look over this paper, it will point out the important contribution the Sarnia area is making along with many other centres towards the growth and development taking place across our whole Province of Ontario.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here answers to a very large number of questions. I assure my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) that I worked very hard this weekend getting all the answers ready. I have answers to questions 43, 20, 49, 39, 48, 26, 40, 41, 56, 57, 54, 34, 42 and 55.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-third Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to Provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area for certain financial and other circumstances,"

MR. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I follow today, after four hours of talk on this particular order of the day by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), and after that I am still able to say that I believe in free speech, but I understand very much better now why totalitarian countries, such as the one to which he owes spiritual allegiance, have to curb such a precious privilege as freedom of speech.

Just imagine running loose in one of those countries behind the Iron Curtain, an oppositionist with the glib tongue , with the looseness of facts, and with the abuse of parliamentary privileges, that were exhibited in this House on Thursday of last week.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is permissible for any member here to criticize another member for using loose facts. I think it is unparliamentary and I appeal to you, sir, to state your opinion. I certainly deny ever using facts loosely and I do not think that this member should be allowed to use these words. I use nothing but facts, but the hon. member has not known a fact in so many years that he would not recognize it.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked for a clarification and then used the same condemnation himself.

MR. ROBERTS: I think when I have finished, perhaps the House can judge for itself, but I was going to add that my learned friend has peculiarly

anticipated my statement, which is his characteristic.

He was supposed to be talking on Bill No. 80 in those four hours of what I think were the worst sort of drivel that I have ever listened to in the seven or eight years I have sat in this House. He never touched on any argument actually on the subject before the House. He did demonstrate he was able to count to ten and go back down to one, and count it over again on Thursday, and I believe on Friday he got as far as twelve, but when real figuring came into the picture, such as in the merit of the unconditional grants of this government as in this Bill No. 80, or in any one of its corollary bills, then he is lost in the fog of his own making, just as thick as the one in which his recent Massey Hall friend is used to travelling in.

At 3.30 on Thursday he quoted as the chief supporters of this Bill, bond dealers and people who, he said, would like it because they would expect to make money out of it. At 4.30 he quoted one of the leading bond dealers as authority for being against the Bill.

At one point he accused the government of blitzkrieg tactics in dealing with this legislation, and within one more hour he shows that the government had been deliberating for three years on it.

At one moment he laments the loss of many jobs, and at the next he decries what he says will be increased cost, blaming this government for doing that.

On Friday, he wanted, I understand, practically every service within the Bill to be supplied at less than cost, and in the same hour he asked for the power to put on additional taxes. There was dialectic materialism, three, four, five or six illustrations of it in that speech of his.

MR. SALSBERG: Would you tell us what "dialectic materialism" is?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I will. It is the use of any words in any sense for argument to the object desired. The use of such words in quite the opposite argument for the exact opposte point; in both cases without regard to the truth.

(Take B follows)

Mr. Speaker, I have learned during my lifetime that there are many curious things in the world, and there is one thing which I believe frequents the Pacific Ocean, occasionally gets into the Atlantic Ocean, and even into the North Atlantic. It is a species of fish known as the "stingaree", or the "stinging ray", and I say that those spokesmen, whoever they may be, whatever their present outward appearance, and no matter how plausible they may seem, when speaking of this particular poison we are all bound to recognize, are very aptly described as "stingarees". The more we see of them, no matter how disguised, and cloaked in the poison of Communism -- the more we see of them as they are, the safer we will be.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this particular part of my remarks -- and I see the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) is in his seat, may I say that both he and I occupy seats in this Legislature representing ridings very close to that of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), and we both agree with the last paragraph appearing in an article in Time magazine, where it says:

> "Now that his overriding loyalty to Communism is revealed, Salsberg's political number if probably up. Toronto's leading

> rabbi, Abraham Feinberg, has denounced Communism's anti-Jewish trend. The Canadian Jewish Congress has pointedly warned Canadian Jews to beware of 'local resident agents of Communism.... who can no longer crawl under a rug because they are now out in the open.' Many of Joe Salsberg's constituents, previously unconcerned about his Red ties, can be expected to heed such warnings the next time he stands for re-election."

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to deal with Bill No. 80. I trust I have not digressed from the rules of the House too much, but my few remarks were made as the result of some remarks made on last Thursday and Friday --

MR. SALSBERG: There was one other remark the hon. member does not refer to, and that was the suggestion we meet the electors of St. Patrick's riding and I would discuss with him these matters before those electors, the electors of Beverley Street, St. George, McCaul, Huron, Madison and the others. How about taking me on? Let the hon. member and I go together and discuss it in his riding. I challenge him to do that.

MR. ROBERTS: The only suggestion I have to make is to have the hon. member for St. Andrew resign his seat and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will throw the seat open for a bi-election --

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member for St.Patrick is afraid to meet my challenge to discuss with him these matters in his own riding.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: My only suggestion is, if the hon. member is so bold, let him resign his seat, and we will soon clean up the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to perhaps a more pleasant matter. On the same day in this House, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) was speaking to this same Bill, and he suggested that having been Toronto-born and brought up, he sometimes yearned for the rural way of life, even when he was speaking in regard to the metropolitan area. I do not have to yearn for that, because I come from the outside. I remember in my youth moving in those fine bucolic scenes characteristic of Bay of Quinte district, and even now, recalling them, I have some feeling of nostalgia. However, I came here with my eyes open, and have been here quite a while, and the longer I stay here the better I like it, so I can speak today as a Torontonian on this metropolitan area Bill.

In 1950, going back three years -- an application was made by the city of Toronto, and at

that time there appeared in an issue of the Globe & Mail, of February 6th, 1950, this heading, "Amalgamation Canada's most Complex Job," and amongst the pictures of the heads of a dozen of the municipal suburban areas, appears the countenance of my friend, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Beech), who was then the Reeve of York Township, and the comely features of the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon) who was then the Reeve of Swansea, and others. That was three years ago.

In January, 1953, almost three years to a day, what has now become known familiarly as the "Cummings Report" was issued. It is published in book form, and as everybody knows, was received with very wide interest at that time. I see the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope), and two or three of the hon.members representing northern ridings and may I say to them, and to the other hon. members of the House that it has been my lot during recent years to travel into the north, and when I say that, I am not speaking of the "banana belt" of Port Arthur, Fort William, Sudbury and Cochrane, but rather up in the wastes bordering on the Arctic Circle. Last August, at the tip of Hudson's Bay, I touched down on a little hamlet, on the bleak and barren land shores of Hudson's Bay, at a point called Chesterfield Inlet, a little hamlet where there were but a few Eskimoes, a St.Therese

hospital, a radio station and an R.C.M.P. outpost station, a little hamlet where during the few months of summer it becomes a port of call for an occasional steamer, which would lighten its very welcome cargo of mail and supplies for the residents of that very isolated spot, and I thought at that time that 150 years previously there was a little hamlet down at the foot of Church Street, and below Front Street, fronting on Lake Ontario, with a population no greater than that of that isolated northern hamlet today, and yet from that beginning has grown this great city and the metropolitan area, at that time simply a pinpoint on a large-scale map of 150 years ago. At that time, the problems with which the residents had to deal involved unity to live; at this time, the problems with which the residents of this area have to deal is unity to expand.

One-quarter of the population of Ontario, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, is in an area about 15 miles by 15 miles, 240 square miles, and one-quarter of the commercial, financial and industrial power not of Ontario, but of the whole Dominion of Canada, is contained in that small area. In the very centre of that area, Mr. Speaker, is the riding of St. Patrick, and the very geographical centre of that riding of St. Patrick is where we are sitting today, in the

Parliament Buildings of this great province of Ontario.

So quite naturally we are all very greatly interested in the Bill which is before the House at this time.

A word now to digest the Cummings Report. While it was received well at the start, it was not long before there was criticism, often amounting to a flood of premature and perhaps not well thought-out criticism before this Legislature acted. I, myself, and I suppose other hon. members for the area, have received a certain amount of comments, and one of the least complimentary, and perhaps the most terse of any of them which I received, reads as follows:

> "Is monstrous.
> Is Dark Ages repeat.
> Is Geo. Orwell's '1984', come earlier.
> And all for a passing dish of pea soup."

And they put something at the end, which was intended to more or less "put me on the spot" by saying:

> "Thanking you for previous accomplishments on our behalf."

Mr. Speaker, it was not very long after that letter was received until the hon. Prime Minister rose in his place in this House and introduced Bill No. 80, and we all remember the way it was received on February 25th. Here is one heading, "Federation Starts January 1st, Frost's Aid cuts City Taxes".

Following that, I think there has been an almost steady decline of criticism, and a great rise in popular acclaim for the general features of the Bill, and the purposes it has in mind.

It will be found that this Bill follows the Cummings Report in some respects, and departs from it in others. The main criticism of the Report, before the Bill was introduced, was the apparent appointive features of the first council. The Act makes the council elective. This provides for a free election by ballot, and may I say to the hon. members, just imagine that type of choice behind the Iron Curtain and in use there, and yet the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) who spoke before me, complained that this particular method of election was not the completely Simon-pure type of democratic choice. The best principles of democracy are recognized in this particular part of the legislation. There are no refinements with respect to the elective principle; the council, as you know, will be set up composed of twenty-four members, nine from each Ward in Toronto, two of the leading controllers and the Mayor, and twelve Reeves or heads of the suburban areas.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) told us all that even in greater detail.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member for St. Andrew should be the last one to complain about a little repetition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: The metropolitan school board applies the same principles, with perhaps some slight qualifications, in regard to the election of the board members. The people's money will be expended by the people's elected representatives. There are 15 parts to the Act, and the road is left wide open throughout; we can go along a certain distance, and if it is then considered feasible, and in the best interest of all parties of the metropolitan area, we can have a complete amalgamation resulting without any unnecessary unscrambling, and we can go on to confederation in full bloom. That is an important and elastic feature in the Bill, and in my opinion, those who drafted the Bill, are entitled to a great deal of credit for having set it up in this manner. The continuity of the present link between the Metropolitan Council and the Area Councils may be new. It is new to me, To my way of thinking, however, it is one of the best features one could possibly get during this period of change-over, because there you have your local elected councillors tied in with the Metropolitan Council, and nobody can say

that the Metropolitan Council will be in conflict with the other councils, when they are so closely connected in that way by the elective system.

The part with respect to assessment brings up a point which I think is worth emphasizing, and I am glad the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on Friday made it quite clear that there was no need for any experienced, faithful employees, whether they be assessors, civil servants, veterans, or whoever they may be, losing their employment under any part of this new Bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a feature in this which seems to me to be very interesting in connection with the relative position of the city of Toronto and the suburban areas at the present time as regards population, debenture debts, and equalized assessment. The figures show that the ratio of Toronto population to the whole area, including Toronto, or rather, the ratio of Toronto's growth in debenture debt to the whole growth of debenture debt of the whole area, including Toronto, and the ratio of Toronto assessment as equalized with all the other areas, is almost identical throughout, and is worked out at almost an exact 60/40 position, all the way through. That I think is very important, and while there are glaring differences between

some of the suburban municipalities, the fact that the suburban municipalities as a whole and the city of Toronto as a whole, are so closely connected in this proportion, whether it be for debt, for population, or for assessment, will prove to be of considerable help in working out this great plan at the present time.

The Metropolitan Roads System gives many safeguards, in the development of these roads, and the provisions of the Bill make it quite certain they will not be taken on haphazardly, but will be making a serious effort to carry through the provisions in the way that is contemplated.

The Toronto Transportation System: I think the criticism of the Metropolitan Area transportation system will be dispelled very rapidly, particularly when we have such a watch-dog as the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings), who will follow me in this debate, and the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett) who has been very very, active in working out the details in connection with this matter at this time. It is no secret that the Toronto and York Government members have been meeting and studying this very carefully and very intensively, and it is also no secret that the hon. Prime Minister himself has said there will be

amendments. I think that is so. I think there will be certain amendments presented in this House both by those hon. members sitting on the Government side and those sitting in Opposition.

The finances in connection with this matter is something I think is of very great importance, but again I would like to say to the hon. members, when discussing the question of finances, try to find out what the position will be and do not forget the compensating unconditional grant of $4.00 per head of population, when talking about the apparent loss by one of the municipalities or the other. The grant was made to help the metropolitan plan, and help the whole provincial-municipal government scheme.

One criticism of the Cummings Report was that no study was given to the situations in other places. At page 42 of the Report, Mr. Cumming and Mr. Myer -- to whom I think we owe a great deal of credit for the splendid report and the studies and work shown by it --explainthe reason why no studies were made in other places, and I feel sure that the hon. members will agree that the Report itself was of great assistance in preparing the legislation which is now before this House.

They say:

> "For the reasons which have been stated the board has not had the advantage of hearing any exposition or discussion of the types of metropolitan organization which have been adopted in other places and it has been unable to undertake any independent study or research in the limited time available."

So, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that the Board did not have the opportunity, but the Government does not overlook such an important matter, and a study was made and information was obtained in regard to the conditions in several municipalities or suburban areas of the same size.

(TAKE C FOLLOWS)

For instance, the Government has studied the Digest concerning the London area, and while it may some things in common, it also shows that the problems they have there are quite diverse, and in many respects, too, quite different from here; but one thing that strikes me about that area, is that that particular area was set up in a much more unwieldly manner than is proposed in this legislation here in this Bill.

In New York the study showed the Bill there, that New York was actually found to be on an election basis of a long-term office, and as you know, they elect almost everybody under the sun, including the judiciary, so that it is rather difficult to have any of that sort of thing in any plan that might be introduced here.

Incidentally, I notice that in the New York area no salary is paid to school trustees. That position is one of some importance, and while they do not have them there, it does not necessarily mean they should not be paid somewhere else, but that is the case in New York.

In Boston there was a study of the situation existing there, and they are still in the midst of studying and trying to work out a solution.

Professor Robson, who is an expert on this sort of thing, has published a book, "The Development of Local Government", as a Professor of public administration at the University of London, he favours the creation in the great English Metropolitan centres

of directly elected regional council covering the industrial, commercial and residental core, besides a wide stretch of rural and semi-rural hinterland, extending far beyond the suburbs, and comprising dormitory settlements, outlying villages and farms, a green belt or a rown agricultural belt, garden cities,smaller towns and so forth.

Regional council covering areas of that sort are also supported by Mr. McDonald of the University of California,in recommendations that he has made under the heading of, "Regional Plan". He states that the plan which has the most gripped the imagination of administrators and students of government is the creation of a new political area -- the region. He gives the clear impression that this is the plan which he himself endorses.

Professor John C. Bollens of the University of California, dealing with annexation, makes a rather pungent statement. He was preparing a survey for the International City Managers Association in 1951, and this is what he said:

> "A city needs to have not only a general policy and a specific plan regarding annexation, but also the means of putting them into action. When a city finds itself hemmed in by smaller incorporated places, it is then too late to use annexation, and other area-wide means must be utilized."

Now, Mr. Speaker, without taking too much time of the House, I just want to say that at this time it seems to me that what this great region of

the metropolitan area of Toronto and the suburban area needs today is not the mailed fist of a seizing baron, but the kindly hand of a guiding physician, and the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and his government, with the legislation of Bill No. 80, and the corollary bills that they have introduced, are offering just that.

Bill No. 80 is a great milestone in the March of Progress, in setting up this metropolitan area. It will, I hope, make this area greater still in the course of time, and perhaps we will become known as the best legislated and the best administered metropolitan area on the North American Continent. I am not only pleased, but I am proud to support the second reading of this comprehensive legislation.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make some remarks on the second reading of Bill No. 80, I want to make it clear to the House that my remarks are neither hastened nor slowed down by the editorial in the Globe and Mail the other day. It just happened that I felt that this was the best time to place before the House some views that I possess in relation to this Bill.

I was thinking that perhaps the Globe and Mail could serve a very real purpose in this matter instead of casting aspersions on hon. members, if they would set down in clear and bold type just how they stand in regard to this particular Bill. It would be interesting to see just what their reaction would be.

I hope that in my remarks this afternoon I will not be put in the position of pulling any of the Globe and Mail acorns out of the fire. If I do that, it will be quite inadvertent, . I assure the House.

I have no apologies to make to the Globe and Mail or to anyone else for speaking at this time on this Bill.

It is not a Bill, as the House recognizes it, which affects, in the main, the Province of Ontario. It is a Bill, the provisions of which deal with the City of Toronto suburban areas, and as such, to those of us who are outside this area, it seems to me we can serve the public interest the better by not having simply

heard from the hon. ministers of the government, six or seven in number, setting out to the House just how their particular departments will be affected with the passing of this Bill, and how their particular departments can work into the frame-work of this Bill in operation.

(Take D- follows)

It seems, however, that inasmuch as this Bill affects this particular area, we can best size the situation up in the public interest by hearing from those who, like the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), are opposing the Bill, and the hon. member from St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts), who are supporting it. I feel, in expressing my views at this time and the views of those who sit around me, we can render the best possible service to those who will speak from the other ridings in Toronto, and who will have the privilege of criticising or adding to some of the thoughts that I have, and give their expressions in respect to the Bill itself.

As I said, Bill No. 80 deals with the City of Toronto and the twelve suburban areas, municipalities in themselves. It has been, I think, in the view of all of us, a very interesting growth which has taken place in this area over the last number of years. Here you have the City of Toronto proper and all around the fringe of that great City you have these twelve suburban areas which have grown to almost the size of the mother city itself and in many respects is indistinguishable from the City of Toronto. When that sort of condition has grown up over the years, two or three things come to mind.

In the first place, there must be legislation that will enable these municipalities to get together in the common good. There must be an understanding that they may come into the fold on some basis, and then within the fold render the greatest possible service, not only to themselves, but to the unit as a whole. I believe all of us in the House this afternoon, perhaps even the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) himself, will say that legislation bearing on this matter is at least ten years too late. We are late in getting started, and it does seem to me if we had started on this matter some ten years ago, we would have by this time got around a lot of the difficulties, and we would have a much larger family around the City of Toronto than we presently have.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, we have before us now Bill No. 80. The guiding principle of that Bill, as I read it, is that there shall be a unification of some of the major services over the wider area, including the City of Toronto and the twelve suburban areas. This matter was discussed, as the House will recall, very thoroughly before the Municipal Board, and the solution suggested by the Municipal Board was not the only possible solution. There were, I would say, at least three clear lines

the Board could have taken in making recommendations to the Government for the better governing of this Greater Metropolitan Area. They could have said, if they had chosen to do so, that we should have amalgamation all across the board, that these municipalities should have been drawn together and held by any means which could have been worked, to solve the problems in that regard.

We had, as older hon. members of the House will recall, an instance of that in the City of Windsor some years ago, in the 1930's, I believe, when there was in that instance a complete and total amalgamation. It was possible in the City of Windsor, and I think, looking at it from this vantage point, all of us will agree that was the best solution, although it may have seemed a little harsh at the time.

The Municipal Board could have suggested to the Government that they bring about total and complete amalgamation of the City of Toronto and the twelve suburban areas. They could have suggested that there would be progressive amalgamation; that is, municipalities which were willing and ready to come into the fold would be taken in, and those who remained outside would always have the latch-string out for them and could be admitted periodically,

from time to time, until the whole unit became one.

The third thing they could do -- and this is what they did -- was recommend to the Government that for the time being they would recommend there be a unification of essential services, and that is what we have embodied in Bill No. 80.

I want to follow rather closely the principle embodied in the Bill. I do not see what good purpose can be served in going into the sidelines of this issue at this time. We shall have before us in due course the Bill in Committee stage, and all of us on this side of the House and on the other -- as the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) suggested a moment ago -- will have an opportunity to pose amendments to certain Sections, and we shall take part in the debate in the Committee stage in an effort to improve the Bill.

Dealing with the recommendations contained in the Bill, I want to suggest to the House that it seems to me the Government is on a very precarious foundation, in this respect, that there has never been a petition from any one of the municipalities since the Bill was announced and since the Municipal Board reported, to be included in this sort of scheme. There has been no vote, not even a straw

vote, in any one of the municipalities concerned, indicating that they were in favour of this scheme and in favour of uniting their municipalities with the provisions of the Bill.

I would say to the Government and to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that in that very regard I would not like to be in his place on this particular matter. It seems to me the Government is rushing into this thing without having a proper knowledge of what they are suggesting, or whether it is in the best interests of the people concerned. They are in the position of one who prescribes cough medicine or a patent medicine to someone, and says, "Now, open your mouth; it is good for you and if you swallow it you will be better."

I would suggest, too, to the hon. Prime Minister that in some way he should have received from some of these municipalities a test vote of some kind which would indicate they are in favour of the plan that is now submitted within the covers of Bill No. 80. It is in this atmosphere, Mr. Speaker, that the plan is now before us, and it is in this atmosphere I want to discuss it, and to say definitely to the House that I do not follow the recommendations contained in this Bill and I do not believe that the purpose of the Bill will

be for the benefit of this great Metropolitan Area.

I would like to outline as briefly as I can some of the reasons which prompted me to make that statement, and to come to that conclusion. On January 1st, 1954, we are going to have this self-imposed super Council of some twenty-five members who will rule over this Metropolitan Area. The Chairman of this Council, for the time being, is to be an appointee of the Government, through the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. May I point out to the hon. Prime Minister and to the House some of the reasons why I say I cannot go along with the Government in saying that this is a remedy for the ills that beset this great Metropolitan district.

In the first place, this Bill -- whether we like it or not -- sets a precedent and prescribes a pattern for similar happenings throughout the Province of Ontario in the days that lie ahead. Who is there to say that the City of Hamilton or the City of London or the City of Windsor, or some other area in this Province, will not suffer intensely the same kind of growing pains this district has had over a number of years? I for one would not like this Bill to become a Provincial statute, and thereby institute a pattern to prescribe means by which these other municipalities could

obtain relief under similar legislation. There are some nine hundred other municipalities in this Province, and their opinions and their views of the impact of this legislation upon them must be considered as we discuss the Bill.

Then, of course, the more important thing -- and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) recognizes it -- is that the Bill itself contains no provisions,nor is there any promise held out by this Administration, that will solve the financial problems of this new Metropolitan Area. It is true we have added some $4 per capita instead of the fire and police grants, and so on, but over the broad picture this Bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to guarantee to the residents of the new Metropolitan Area that because of the passage of this legislation their financial burdens or their financial troubles will be eased in any way, shape or form.

I suggest to this House this afternoon that after this Bill has been in operation for a number of years we will find, unless something is done other than is proposed in this Bill, not only will not we/have reduced taxation in this area but there will be mounting taxation. In other words, what I am endeavouring to "get across" is this, that this Bill

does not strike at the roots of the problem, it does not get down to the grass roots, it does not come to grips with the great and pressing problems which affect not only Toronto and the suburban areas, but every other municipality in the Province of Ontario. If this Bill is to be effective it must, I submit, include a remedy for the lifting of some of the services presently borne by municipalities and placing them on the shoulders of the Provincial Government.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is a very grave complication. I do not want to be a party to holding out to the residents of this Metropolitan Area that the passing of this Bill and the implementation of legislation under the Bill is going to mean for them a lowering of their tax rate, because we would just be fooling ourselves and we would be taking a hypocritical and an unreal attitude.

What will happen will be increased taxation, and I think we in the House pretty well agree with that. Yet we are trying to sell the people the idea that if they come into this scheme taxes will be lessened.

I would like to see in this Bill some remedy

for the financial problems of the thirteen municipalities. If there are any remedies they will be only temporary. All you can possibly do under this Bill is to scrape a little bit off the top of a pile of inequalities which have grown up over the years, and let that little bit of inequality fall into a niche or groove, but the basis of the inequalities remain and it will grow again and become just as large and just as important in the lives of the citizens of this Metropolitan Area.

There is nothing fundamental in the Bill which will help the people of this municipality or this great area to meet their financial obligations.

I want to say just a word or two with respect to the Council itself. I want to say this to the House in all seriousness. The super-Council proposed for this Metropolitan Area follows very closely the County Council system. Hon. members who have had experience with county councils pretty well agree on that.

I would suggest to the House, Mr. Speaker -- and I have not heard anything in the debate thus far that would change my mind -- that while the county council is an admirable unit of government for a rural county or municipality or group of

municipalities, it cannot be expected to do a good job when put in control of such a great population as this, with such divergent problems, with such great sums of money to be handled. It is not equipped to do that job. The County Councils meet, some of them, three times a year, sometimes more often than that. In my own County of Grey I think they meet in January, then again in June and again in November.

I would suggest to the House that we are going a long way if we expect a system which works admirably in rural counties in this Province to do a good job when put in control of this great Metropolitan Area we have in mind. I think that the County Council system, transplanted into this area and faced with this task, will be too cumbersome, will be too slow, You will not be able to get decisions which must be reached in a reasonable length of time.

I do not for one minute, Mr. Speaker, think we can transplant the County Council system into this area and expect it to do the job this Bill sets out for it.

In regard to this super-Council itself, I frankly do not like the set-up in spite of what the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) said. The

men who are aldermen in this city, and the men who are reeves and mayors of the various municipalities around the city, are men who are busy in their normal business life. I think one need only recall that there are railroad men in the position of reeve and mayor, and business men of various kinds. It may be that these men can take the time to do a job in their particular ward or in their particular municipality, but when it comes to doing a job in a ward or a municipality, and then again in the Metropolitan Council, I suggest to this House we are asking too much of men who, on their own, must earn a living for themselves and their families.

Another thing I do not agree with, Mr. Speaker, is this: The hon. member for St.Patrick said this was the best system that could be devised, but it seems to me that in these local municipalities when you elect your mayor the issues are local in character. It may be, as has happened in the past, there will be quite a "hot" election in the various municipalities, and a man may be elected because he took a certain stand on local issues; he will be elected mayor of his municipality, and then he wakes up to find that not only is he mayor of his own municipality but he is on the Metropolitan

Council as well, and he may be there without any training and without any desire to be on the Metropolitan Council. His concern is local, and it may be that he has not the time or the inclination to serve both on the local council and the Metropolitan council.

MR. MACAULAY: Then he should not run.

MR. OLIVER: Perhaps not, but as I said a moment ago -- if the hon. member for Riverdale will permit me -- this man is concerned with the issues in his locality; he feels very keenly about them. There is no reason why locally he should not run, but every reason why he should run in order that his ideas might be made use of in the local municipality, but that does not necessarily mean that he is a good man to go to the Metropolitan Area council.

Then there is the question of costs which I think must enter into this. You are going to have a council of some twenty-four, which roughly would cost $50,000; you are going to pay the Chairman of the Board some $15,000 more, and these men are not going to work by themselves. No one can expect them to; they have to have personnel surrounding them, they have to have advisers, and you are going to run into a bill for administration alone of well over a couple of hundred thousand dollars before you go

very far in this matter.

I might as well say it to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that I thought we were getting to the place in this area when we wanted to cut down a bit on governments. What this Bill is doing is making a new set of governmental officials in the City of Toronto. There would be the Wards and there would be the Metropolitan Area, and right in the centre of it, as the hon. member for St. Patrick said, you have the Parliament Buildings of the Province of Ontario grinding out new laws for these very same people. It seems to me we have gone too far along the line of duplication in government, and if we could do something to cut down not only the expense of government but the number of governments, in the view of the people concerned, we would be going a long way. This, of course, goes the other way.

Another thing that seems to be wrong with this Bill is that all of us, irrespective of party, hope to achieve amalgamation, whether it is two years or five years hence. I do not believe the benefits of getting together will be realized before there is amalgamation of these various areas.

I suggest to the Government that what they

are doing under this Bill is delaying the day when amalgamation will come to Toronto and these twelve suburban areas.

Each system of government which we set up has a habit of wanting to perpetuate itself, wanting to stay in office, wanting to cling to the sort of government they have at the moment, and this sort of thing, I suggest, is going to delay the final settlement of this problem rather than hurry it, as we would all want the case to be. There will be built up over the years, not a desire for amalgamation, but a resistance to amalgamation right within your Metropolitan Council, and you are going to delay rather than hurry the final settlement of this problem.

Another thing I desire to say is, I have heard no real excuse from the Government as to why the fire and police services were not taken over by the Metropolitan area. It would seem to me they were two things that should have been taken over. First of all, in order that there may be co-operation between the Fire Departments and the Police Departments in these fourteen areas, and, yet, they are not in this Bill. That is one reason why I say we should be slow to adopt this solution or proposed solution to the problem.

In conclusion, I would say I believe that rather than have this Bill we should have had a system of progressive amalgamation. I believe we should have had legislation whereby these municipalities which wanted to come into this union could do so at once, and after they had become assimilated with the union, other municipalities could come in under a system of amalgamation.

I believe also we should have an appeal to the people as to what they want to do about these matters. I am, after all, Mr. Speaker, a Democrat, and you cannot be a Democrat and a believer in democratic principles without resorting to the people and asking them if they are in favour of this or that plan, or if they are not. For the reasons I have outlined to the House this afternoon, I cannot support the second reading of this Bill, and I believe that when a vote is taken in the House -- and I hope there will be a vote -- a number of hon. members will not favour this legislation, because I believe it makes for government that is too cumbersome; we believe there should have been an appeal to the people as to what they thought about it, and we feel fundamentally that progressive amalgamation would have been a better solution than the one offered in the terms of this Bill.

(E-1 follows)

In conclusion, I would say I believe that
[illegible] should be allowed more a
system of [illegible] legislation. I believe we
should have the initiative strongly so [illegible]
[illegible] to vote into law matters which is
[illegible] and after they had become established
[illegible] those [illegible] would come in
under a system of [illegible].

I believe that we should [illegible] to
the people if [illegible] in a major issue
matter. I'm [illegible], Mr. Governor, I [illegible]
[illegible] to a [illegible] and I believe in
[illegible] initiative matters according to the
[illegible] that we have it now in Oregon
[illegible] I cannot subscribe to all those [illegible]
I cannot subscribe the remedy [illegible] [illegible].
[illegible] believe that even a vote is taken on the
[illegible] -- but I [illegible] will be a vote -- I remain
at home. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible],
because I believe it makes for [illegible] that is
[illegible]. We believe there should be
[illegible] in the courts as to what may [illegible]
about it, and we [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
Legislature would then have a [illegible] [illegible]
in our opinion in the terms of this act.

(Mr. Tolman)

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a very great privilege and with that privilege, indeed a responsibility, in rising and supporting a second reading to what, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, will be a great red letter day in the history of the Greater Metropolitan Area of Toronto, when Bill No. 80 receives Royal Assent and is proclaimed law.

I had the honour, Mr. Speaker, of representing the area I now represent in this House in the Toronto City Council for a period of 7 years, from 1944 to 1950. During that period the tax levy of Toronto rose from approximately $35,000,000 in 1944 to over $70,000,000 in 1950. I know of the problems confronting the Municipality of Toronto and its need for expansion.

In 1950, I supported the application of Toronto to the Municipal Board for amalgamation. On January 20th, 1953, the decision of the Municipal Board was handed down refusing the application of Toronto and Mimico for outright amalgamation.

A week ago last Wednesday the Government introduced in this Legislature Bill No. 80. Mr. Speaker, how close to amalgamation does Bill No. 80 bring us?

The Metropolitan Council

If the Order of the Municipal Board was for complete amalgamation I suppose the ward system would be the basis of organization, that is 1 mayor, a board of control, 2 aldermen for each ward and committees of council charged with responsibility of the whole area.

I could not conceive of more than say 5 additional wards, each with 2 aldermen and say 2 additional controllers. A total of 12, making a huge council of 35 members.

Bill No. 80 provides for the Mayor of Toronto, 2 top elected controllers and the top elected aldermen for each ward in Toronto. A total of 12, plus 12 Reeves or Mayors from the 12 surrounding municipalities, plus a Chairman. A total of 25.

It seems that the only point at issue is whether they should be elected as direct representatives to the Metropolitan Council. I prefer the plan suggested in the Bill, for the time being at least, because for the organization period they are tied into their local councils. I predict that this section of the Bill will become so popular, Mr. Speaker, that it will spark the enthusiasm of both candidates for office and the electors in

bringing out one of the largest votes in the history of Greater Toronto.

Now we leave intact the local area councils free to deal with local problems and local improvements. I am fearful that under complete amalgamation there would be a flow of demands for work and services under the local improvement by-law that would be impossible for the local councils to cope with. Now the value of local area councils will be to control this demand in their own areas and attempt to work out an orderly programme of undertakings. These councils will be closer to the people than a council in the centre of the whole area.

Assessment

A complete amalgamation would provide for one equalized assessment for the whole of the Greater Area. Bill No. 80 provides for the taking over of all the assessment departments, assessors, personnel and equipment and providing for an equalized assessment, Mr. Speaker, complete amalgamation in assessment.

Graded Partial Exemptions

Mr. Speaker, I believe The Toronto Daily Star and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) made some reference to the fact that no provision

had been made in Bill No. 80 for the granting of graded partial exemptions on homes assessed from under $ 2,000 to $4,500.

I might point out to the House that some years ago, probably 25 years ago, the taxpayers of the city of Toronto, by vote, approved of this partial exemption. I believe this exemption amounts to about $72,000,000 of assessment. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that under complete amalgamation partial exemptions would be completely wiped out, as this exemption was only granted by Toronto, and I believe, New Toronto. Bill No. 80 does not prevent Toronto from continuing the partial exemption if it so wishes. I believe this is a question the City Council could well submit to the taxpayers in a question at the next municipal election.

Pooling of Financial Strength and Resources

In seeking amalgamation Toronto offered to throw in to the common pot all its assets, its assessable wealth and its credit and to turn these things over without compensation to a new city which would assume all the outstanding debts of every kind of all the 13 municipalities. The Federation plan calls for the pooling of only certain specified assets used to supply services of an area-wide

character. However, the credit and financial strength of the whole area is combined for both local and area purposes. Thereby the greatest possible borrowing power of the entire area is obtained. The assets which are taken over are only the assets needed to provide essential services for the whole area. No portion of the area will be required to pay taxes for purely local services in another municipality. Under amalgamation all services would be financed by over-all taxation. Under Federation only those services which are essential to the growth and prosperity of the area are financed by metropolitan taxation. The only services which will be financed out of the metropolitan taxation are sewage disposal, metropolitan roads, publicly assisted housing, metropolitan parks, the building of schools and a substantial part of the cost of operating schools. In addition the cost of making the annual assessments will be charged over the whole area and the cost of metropolitan administration. It is my belief that an increase in the aggregate cost of municipal and educational services would be inevitable under the amalgamation plan and this increase would be serious because all services would have to be brought up to a uniform standard, probably as high as that in the city itself.

Water Supply and Distribution

This service is not financed out of taxation anywhere in the metropolitan area but is paid for by water rates. Under complete amalgamation both wholesale and retail distribution would be under a single, central water authority. Under the Federation Plan, wholesale and distribution only is unified and placed under central control. This will cost the least possible amount and will still permit the local municipalities to fix retain water rates at any level they desire, and to economize in local administration, and if they wish to use the surplus in the reduction of local tax rates. At the same time, it permits badly needed over-all planning of the necessary future additions.

Sewage and Drainage

Practically all the benefits of complete amalgamation are obtained under this plan with respect to major sewage and drainage facilities. Under amalgamation the whole cost of collecting and disposing of sewage and storm water drainage would be borne by metropolitan taxation. Under the Federation Plan local services would be paid for by local taxation but badly needed centralized control and planning of the major services would be obtained.

A unified control of all matters relating to water supply, sewage disposal and storm water drainage in the city of Toronto and the 12 related areas is a matter of urgent necessity. There should be set up a single authority to co-ordinate and control in order to secure maximum efficiency and economy.

For the whole metropolitan area Lake Ontario will ultimately be for the most part:

(a) the source of water supply,

(b) the receiving water for all sewage effluents and storm water drainage.

The Toronto sources of water supply at Toronto Island and Victoria Park should ultimately furnish filtered water to most of the metropolitan area. The new Toronto and Scarborough sources of water supply, together with the Etobicoke, Weston and North York wells, should be continued in use as at present.

No further development of the existing sources of water supply in the related areas should be made other than is considered essential to provide the necessary supply until such time as the Toronto sources are made available. Ultimately a new source of supply should be developed for the easterly section of Scarborough Township.

No further extensions should be made of the city of Toronto water supply on Toronto Island.

The major works have been constructed at Victoria Park for increasing the supply from 100 to 200 million gallons of water per day. This can be accomplished by adding a second intake pipe from the end of the existing intake Tunnel, adding additional pumping equipment, the space for which has been provided in the existing pumping station, and extending the water filtration plant, parts of the foundations for which are already in place.

The related areas can be supplied with Toronto water by the construction of the Parkdale Pumping Station -- and that has been going on for sometime -- and some booster pumping stations along with the necessary main supply lines into the various areas.

The sources of water supply and the number of sewage treatment plants should be kept to a minimum.

Except where a system of combined sewers has been established all sewers constructed in the future in the related areas should be of the separate type.

Where separate sewers are to be constructed a comprehensive plan should be adopted whereby all storm water can be collected and discharged into the nearest existing water course.

As an essential means of carrying out the recommendations submitted herein there should be set up a co-ordinating and financing authority to exercise a unified control over all matters relating to water supply, sewage disposal and storm water drainage so that a progressive programme can be embarked upon, such as has been established in other metropolitan areas.

A unified control over water supply, sewage disposal and storm water drainage can be established in one of two ways:

(a) By annexation or amalgamation.

(b) By setting up a Metropolitan Area Authority with wide powers to supply water to, take sewage from and treat same and provide storm drainage interceptors, leaving each of the related areas to provide and control the local systems of water mains and sewers both sanitary and storm. This will enable the Authority to exercise full control over all such matters in the metropolitan area.

I realize sewage treatment will be one of the problems of the Metropolitan Council. The very best engineering known will have to be secured immediately. The people of the city of Toronto and more particularly the people in Beaches, the Riding I represent. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people in Woodbine, represented by the hon. member (Mr. Fishleigh) and

in Riverdale, represented by the hon. member (Mr. Macaulay). Yes, the 200,000 people living in this area will not tolerate a condition that has been their misfortune to have had to put up with for the past 25 years.

I had not subscribed to the opinion of Gore and Storrie in their report to the York Planning Board that the plant at Asbhridges Bay should be enlarged to take care of the requirements of the whole Metropolitan Area. The plant at Ashbridges Bay was designed for the requirements of a population of about 700,000 people. Every safeguard, Mr. Speaker, will have to be taken to guarantee that no repetition of the smells and pollution of our beaches will ever be permitted again.

Highways and Public Transportation

Under amalgamation the whole cost of streets of all kinds would be borne by general taxation over the whole area. Under the Federation Plan, local streets will be built and maintained by local taxation but the important and costly arterial highways which are needed to develop the area and improve traffic conditions, will be supported by metropolitan taxation. As for public transportation both plans accomplish the same result. Under

amalgamation and Federation the whole of the undertaking and the assets of the Toronto Transportation Commission would be turned over without compensation to a commission operating over the whole area. The need for a single transportation authority over the whole area is recognized in both plans.

I only hope that those private bus companies who have given good service to the municipalities are adequately compensated for in the forceful taking of their businesses or are given permission to give service by agreement, until such time that the Toronto Transit Commission are prepared to give similar service.

Separation from the County of York

The amalgamation scheme would require the complete separation of the 12 suburban municipalities from the County of York for all municipal purposes. The same result is accomplished under the present plan and the same county services which would be transferred to an amalgamted city are being transferred to the new Metropolitan Corporation.

Metropolitan Planning

One of the most important advantages of amalgamation would result from the setting up of a single authority to control general land use and

development in the entire area. Exactly the same result will be accomplished under the present plan and everyone who supported amalgamation for this reason can have no reasonable objection to the centralization of planning authority for the entire Metropolitan Area under Part XII of this Bill. Although subsidiary planning boards can continue for the local municipalities, all local plans and local zoning by-laws must conform to the general metropolitan planning and development.

Health and Welfare

Hospitalization costs, homes for the aged, child welfare, including Children's Aid, consumption after-care and capital hospital costs will all be borne by the Greater Metropolitan Area. A complete amalgamation in health and welfare costs will then permit local councils to supplement all of these grants.

Housing

I know of the problem of providing rental housing in the Toronto area. I well recall the difficulty the Toronto Council encountered in its desire to provide housing in 1946. The taxpayers of Toronto undertook to service land in East York, North York and Etobicoke, to provide 600 rental houses

for returned service men. The cost of servicing these lands cost the taxpayer about $1 million to provide the 600 houses known as wartime housing.

Council further provided about 200 houses within the city limits. The lack of vacant land within the municipal boundaries prevented further houses.

A committee of council in 1952 endeavoured to secure suitable land to be able to participate under legislation of both Dominion and Province, but at every turn some obstacle was in their way. Under provisions in Bill No. 80, I hope immediate progress can be made to provide rental housing. Complete amalgamation, Mr. Speaker, would not provide anything additional that is not provided in Bill No. 80.

Education

The plan for amalgamation would result in the disappearance of all local boards of education for all purposes and the taxation of all property in the area for all school costs over and above legislative grants. The present Bill preserves local boards but provides for a substantial sharing of the cost of building schools where they are needed and the provision of a substantial portion of the cost of operating the schools by over-all

taxation. It seems to me that the amalgamation proposal of the city was based on two assumptions; first, that a single, central board of education could properly handle all the school problems and actual operation of the schools in the whole area of 240 square miles, and I am willing to admit that this is a pretty large assumption. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Dunlop) has stated that in his opinion such a plan would not likely maintain the very important advantage of local interest and citizen participation in local education. The second assumption is that there should be a single, uniform standard of education supported by a uniform rate of taxation over the whole area. This raises the question whether the needs of the whole area are the same and whether the area can pay the cost involved in bringing all standards up to the highest level. Many people doubt whether this would be possible without a serious increase in taxation over the whole area.

The result of complete amalgamation of the educational services would be to force the adoption of a uniform level of service which would mean that Toronto's rate of school expenditures would either be forced down or the expenditures of other sections would be forced up very substantially

and the most likely result that the over-all cost would be greatly increased.

Memorandum re Vote of Electors on Debentures Issues

Section 194 of the Bill has been the subject of some criticism and it has been said that a drastic change in the existing law is made in dispensing with the vote of the electors of the Metropolitan Area on by-laws authorizing the issue of debentures by the Metropolitan Corporation.

This criticism is founded on a misconception of the meaning of the section and a lack of knowledge of the provisions of the Municipal Act and other legislation dealing with the issue of debentures.

Debentures for Local Purposes not Affected

Subsection (2) of Section 194 provides specifically that where debentures are to be issued for the purpose of an area municipality, a vote of the electors of the area municipality is still required if it is now required under any general or special Act. The Metropolitan Council will issue all debentures including those which at the present time are authorized by by-laws of the local municipalities. If these by-laws now require a favourable vote of the electors, a similar vote will

still be required after January 1st, 1954.

Debentures for Metropolitan Purposes

The Bill dispenses with the need for a vote of the electors of the entire Metropolitan area but this provision is not nearly as drastic as it appears for the following reasons:-

(1) The Metropolitan Council can issue debentures only for the limited list of projects which comes under its jurisdiction and nearly all of these projects are included in the list of exceptions which apply to municipal debentures of ordinary municipalities. For example, no vote of an electors is required for the issue of school debentures. (Municipal Act, Section 300, subsection (3)(i). It seems reasonable to assume that debentures for school purposes will be by far the largest amount of new debentures to be issued in view of the growth of the school population in the Metropolitan Area.

(2) Court Houses and Jails - Under the present law neither a city nor a county requires the assent of the electors before issuing debentures for the erection or enlargement and the furnishing and equipment of a court house or jail. (Municipal Act, Section 300, subsection (3)(d)).

(3) Waterworks, Sewage System Debentures - Under the Municipal Act, at the present time no vote of the electors is required when a municipality desires to issue debentures for the purpose of enlarging or extending a waterworks or a sewage or sewer system if the by-law is passed by a vote of three-fourths of all the members of the council and is approved by the Municipal Board. The only change therefore is that the requirement for a three-fourths vote is eliminated.

(4) Public Transportation - Under the present law the city of Toronto can borrow unlimited amounts for the purposes of the T.T.C. without the assent of the electors. This is provided for in special legislation obtained by the city in 1912 before the purchase of the Toronto Railway Company and in what has been called The Toronto Transportation Commission Act, 1920.. The proposal that the Metropolitan Council should be allowed to borrow for the purposes of the new Transit Commission without a vote of the electors therefore represents no change in the present law.

(5) Metropolitan Highways - Although in this case local municipalities must obtain either a favourable vote or a dispensation from the

Municipal Board, there is ample precedent in the existing law for this provision because under Section 13 of the Highway Improvement Act the Council of a County can issue twenty year debentures without the assent of the electors for amounts not exceeding five percent of the equalized assessment of the county, although a two-thirds vote is required.

(6) Grants to Public Hospitals - Under the present law any municipality can borrow unlimited amounts for the purpose of making a grant towards the construction of maintenance of a public hospital. (Municipal Act, Section 386(29)). The proposal to give the same power to the Metropolitan Council is therefore consistent with the existing law.

(7) Public Housing - Under the Housing Development Act, no approval of the electors is required when a municipality by agreement with the Dominion and the Province undertakes to raise money for a joint housing project or to provide any assistance to such a project.

(8) Public Parks - Under the Public Parks Act, a Parks Board can require the issue of debentures within certain limits without the assent of the electors for the purposes of acquiring park lands

provided that it can meet the carrying charges and operating costs out of its statutory one mill limit.

I would like to say a word or two at this point, Mr. Speaker, about the Toronto Industrial Commission. I might say that this Commission over the years has adopted the Federated Plan. It has co-operated with the municipalities and the municipalities have co-operated with the Commission in bringing industry, providing employment and providing taxes to the municipality. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record part of the President's address delivered to these members and subscribers on the 4th day of February, 1953. I quote:

> " The year 1952 has been one of the most successful and progressive in the experience of the Commission.
>
> The new manufacturing undertakings reported for the year exceed in number those of the previous year by more than 50 percent. Most of these firms are starting in Canada in a modest way, even where the parent companies are very large organizations.
>
> This is a favourable factor. The predominance of small factories has always been a feature of local industry. All of Greater Toronto's 4,300 factories of wide diversity average some 43 employees each. This is a

source of buoyancy and strength that takes this district through any periods of stress or change with a resiliency probably unequalled anywhere else in Canada.

Since its inception 24 years ago, the Commission has made a survey each year-end, showing the latest figures on investment, floor space and employment for the new industries it has helped to establish in Greater Toronto. Never before in our history have we been able to report such tremendous gains as those shown in the statistical report on page nine. Capital investment for instance is up another $45,000,000 or over 40 percent. in one single year. Surely this is a wonderful vote of confidence in the Toronto Area by those who know its manufacturing advantages at first-hand."

The Toronto district has the largest concentration of branch plants from abroad for any city in the world. The "middle third" of the entire Canadian market lies within a 100 mile radius of Toronto.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the unconditional grants which will amount to something like four and one-half million dollars to the Toronto Metropolitan Area, will have a great stabilizing effect on the taxation of the area.

The longer I consider this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the more convinced I am that this is the right and

proper procedure to follow. I appeal to all the municipalities concerned to join with this Legislature in taking the broader viewpoint. Let us march forward together in making this Metropolitan Toronto Area one of the greatest federated cities on the North American continent.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not compliment the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on the decision of his Government to assume the entire cost of the organization of the Metropolitan Council for the balance of 1953 and paying the salary of the Chairman for 1954.

My compliments are extended to the hon. Ministers, the Deputy-Ministers, the Municipal Board and all officials who have had a part to play in drafting the legislation now before this House.

(TAKE F FOLLOWS)

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) when speaking on this Bill, said he wondered if it would not be presumptuous on his part, as a boy from the country, to take any part in the debate on the legislation before us. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to disagree with the hon. Minister, but I believe it is the right -- yes, the duty -- of every hon. member in this Assembly to get on his feet and either support or oppose this Bill.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has stated, when introducing the Bill, that it was the most important piece of legislation to come before this House in one hundred years and that over one-quarter of the people of Ontario live in this proposed metropolitan area. This is quite true, and may I remind hon. members that the other three-quarters of the population of this Province live outside the metropolitan area, yet contribute to the revenue of the Government.

I want to say right now I do believe the hon. Prime Minister is genuinely sincere in his desire to work out a solution for this great problem for which, perhaps, past Councils may

have some responsibility. At the outset may I say I do believe that annexation or amalgamation is the only solution.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in knowing what this legislation, if put into effect, is likely to cost the Province of Ontario. First we have the unconditional grants, which will mean an increase to the area of $1,117,000, on a per capita basis. There are seven municipalities, which, according to the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1951, have populations of less than 20,000. They are: Leaside (15,606); Mimico (11,503); New Toronto (11,072); Weston (8,088); Forest Hill (16,374); Long Branch (8,520), and Swansea (8,080).

These municipalities are not getting paid the grant on the formula set out by the hon. Prime Minister last week on a per capita basis, but it seems on the question of need for the extension of certain services, such as water mains and sewers, etc., Mr. Speaker, there are other municipalities in the Province which are desperately in need of additional grants on that basis. The costs of the Assessment Board are also to be met by the Province, and, according to the estimate, it will be approximately $824,000 up to the 3rd of March, 1954.

Other councils have set up a system of equalized assessments, and I believe the only assistance they have received is the $1,500 per year towards the salary of the County Assessor. The Province is also to pay the expenses and indemnities of the Metropolitan Council up to the end of 1954.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) announced the grants for road construction and maintenance are to be increased from 33 1/3 per cent to 66 per cent. Grands on bridges and culverts are to be given up to 80 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I realize that townships to come into this area are already receiv ing grants on that basis, but this concession to Toronto will undoubtedly mean a substantial amount. In addition, the Department of Highways is to take over and assume the maintenance of 42.82 miles of county roads. The Department of Education is also to give increased grants. These are items I am interested in. What are the estimates for these items? Perhaps when these questions are answered, we may find the Metropolitan Area is getting much more than the $4 per capita.

The councils in the Metropolitan Area, Mr. Speaker, have responsibilities, and I am certainly not prepared to buy their support. When the

two-year probationary period is ended, what is likely to happen? Are these additional grants to be withdrawn? As I stated previously, the hon. Prime Minister did say one-quarter of the population of Ontario is living in the Metropolitan Area. I am speaking for the three-quarters of the population living outside, who contribute to the revenue of the Province and are vitally interested in the questions I have asked today.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that will all be discussed in detail on the Bill relating to unconditional grants. I assure the hon. member for Ontario that is not a haphazard arrangement; it is based upon facts.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): We would like to have some estimates, Mr. Speaker, but none have been given up to now.

HON. MR. FROST: The Bill has only been introduced; it has not been up for debate.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): These are questions I think should be answered.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, yes.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): It is very difficult for outside members to convince our local city councils that Toronto is to get the increased

grants, because they are suffering from growing pains and need to extend. The local people have their problems, too, and would like some assurance from the Government that they may get a sympathetic hearing.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that is perfectly plain. I assure the hon. member for Ontario that will be done on second reading. When one speaks of unconditional grants which are to apply to social services, one must take the proportion of those things as they apply to the budgets. We have social service costs in Ontario running from $7 and $8 per capita down to 30 cents.

That is one of the matters which will be fully explained to the hon. member.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Another point is this -- the question of representation. The seven townships I mentioned earlier have populations of less than 20,000. The Township of York East has a population of 63,951; York North, 96,717; York Township, 98,915, and Scarborough, 63,862. Surely some more equitable form of representation can be worked out than that. It means a municipality like Weston, with a population just over 8,000, has equal voting strength with a township like

York North, which has a population of 96,000.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) knows there is one ward in the city with a population of 120,000, with two aldermen; and another ward with two aldermen representing 45,000 people.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Yes, but I think the hon. Prime Minister will agree it seems to be unfair. Take a municipality like Weston, with a population of 8,000, and a municipality like York Township, with 98,000, each being entitled to one vote. I think that is something we should consider. Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister has some solution; I do not know, but I hope he has because I do not think it is fair representation.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that can all be discussed in Committee, and I am quite satisfied to throw that matter wide open.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): These are questions, Mr. Speaker, to be answered when the Bill is in Committee stage. We are withholding our decision on the Bill at the present time. We would also like the assurance of the hon. Prime Minister that those municipalities having annexation or amalgamation in the future, even those which have carried out such programs in recent

years, with all the consequent headaches in connection with providing services badly needed in the areas acquired, will receive the same consideration on the basis of need in respect to education, roads, etc., which the municipalities in the Metropolitan Area will get if this legislation is approved.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in Committee stage it is our intention to consider probably one Part each day, and explain in full detail the meaning of those various points, and, if suggestions can be made to better matters, we shall be very glad to receive them. There is no disposition on the part of the Government to rush this Bill through. It will proceed very carefully with a view to receiving suggestions from hon. members.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Then, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister to assure the House that any future annexations which take place in the Province of Ontario will receive similar treatment, if this legislation is passed.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this point was raised by the hon. member a moment ago. Personally I doubt that the situation will ever arise in this Province, provided there are progressive amalgamations or progressive annexations. That is

happening all the time. This is a peculiar situation which has arisen here, where we have small satellite municipalities closely packed around what one might term the "mother municipality." That situation does not exist elsewhere in Ontario, and I do not believe it is going to exist, for the reason that the other municipalities, such as Ottawa, Kingston, Sarnia and Hamilton, are annexing.

May I point out to the hon. member that the same fiscal arrangements which exist in this area apply now elsewhere in Ontario. I am not speaking now of conditional grants, but about the continuation to municipalities that annex of grants for roads and schools and such things -- for instance, take the City of Kingston.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: And Oshawa, in the hon. member's own riding.

HON. MR. FROST: Yes, there was an annexation in Oshawa.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): That is right.

HON. MR. FROST: In Oshawa the higher grants which applied in the township for education, for roads and other things have all been carried into the amalgamation with the city or the annexation by the city, and the city gets the benefit of it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the basis of

Bill 80 in carrying those things into the Metropolitan Area is similar to what is already being done in other municipalities, including the City of Oshawa and surrounding area.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I well remember the legislation referred to by the hon. Prime Minister; it was introduced in 1951.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): And I believe it was made retroactive to January 1st, 1950.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): The City of Oshawa was applying to the Department of Highways, I believe, for the 50 per cent road subsidy on the part of the township that was annexed -- I believe this was last year, Mr. Speaker -- in compliance with the regulations, and the Department of Highways said they were very sorry --

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, since that time there has been a formula designed which meets the situation, and which I believe will satisfy the hon. member. It provides for a relationship to population and assessment and other factors that are taken, and that has been applied evenly across the Board in Ontario. That was done about two months ago.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): That is quite true, Mr. Speaker. Under legislation enacted in 1951 portions of townships annexed to cities carry that grant with them for a period of five years, and, I believe, for a further five years on a basis of diminishing return, or something of the kind.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): I do not want to stress my own riding, but as an illustration, the township which was annexed to the City of Oshawa took in with it this grant of 50 per cent, say, on highways, but that does not mean any increase in the grants to the City of Oshawa; whereas the setting up of this Metropolitan Area does. The fifty per cent increase, or fifty per cent of the highway subsidy, is now given to the City of Toronto. That was not done in previous annexations.

HON. MR. FROST: Does the hon. member mean on the arterial roads?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Yes.

HON. MR. FROST: That is a different consideration altogether. The arterial roads running through Toronto and into the suburban areas, in all fairness, would qualify for the same grant given to counties for county roads; that is

fifty per cent. That is the basis.

As a matter of fact, of course, in provincial highways leading into the city, we pay 100 per cent, the same as we do throughout the Province. However, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of the suburban roads system it can be considered fair to treat this differently than other municipalities are treated. The intention is to make it even across the board.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to carry on this question, but I agree with the hon. Prime Minister as far as suburban roads are concerned, but I think this 50 per cent grant on roads and maintenance, and 80 per cent on bridges and culverts -- if I understood the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) correctly -- goes on the maintenance budget of the Toronto City Council.

HON. MR. FROST: Oh, no; just on the metropolitan roads system.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) that we are getting into Committee stage right now. I think the principle of the Bill should be discussed. I do not want to interfere with the remarks of the hon. member,

but I think those points should come up in Committee. We are dealing with specific items here which really have nothing to do with the general principle of the Bill, and that is the thing we are debating now.

I did allow the hon. Ministers who were dealing with specific phases of the general principle of the Bill to go ahead, which I considered was necessary in order to bring about a clarification, but I do think we should try to get away from specific questions.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the questions of the hon. member for Ontario are all relevant, and we are very glad to answer them. We bow to your ruling, that it should be done in Committee, but I assure the hon. member that his questions are proper ones and he is entitled to answers, and in Committee he may feel perfectly free to discuss the various points and ask questions regarding them.

MR. SPEAKER: May I reiterate? Please do not feel I am endeavouring to prevent the asking of questions -- I am sure the Government/Minister sponsoring this Bill is ready to answer them -- but I think on second reading hon. members should confine their remarks to the principle of the Bill.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Thank you, Mr.

Speaker, for your advice, but I may say I am not entirely responsible for the digression. I think others will have to take some of the responsibility.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, one other point is this: The majority of the City Council and some members of other township Councils are opposed to this legislation, yet it appears that ten hon. members of this Assembly representing ridings in Toronto may support this legislation. This does seem to be confusing, and I hope during the debate to be able to understand the attitude of the hon. members for Toronto.

HON. MR. FROST: We have listened to two very able addresses this afternoon from two of the hon. members representing Toronto ridings. I think they cleared up a number of points.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): There are still eight to hear from.

HON. MR. FROST: You will hear from them all.

(G-1 follows)

MR. W. E. BRANDON (York West): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the debate on Bill No. 80, I wish first of all to emphasize the fact that this Bill is extremely important to the riding of York West, inasmuch as in that riding we have six complete suburban municipalities represented, and part of another. The last mentioned municipality being York West, and the remainder of that municipality being represented by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Beech).

Initially, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the plan laid out in Bill No. 80 is quite similar to the operation of the County Council, and having been a member in past years of County Council, and having represented one of the suburban municipalities affected by this Bill for more than twelve years in county council, I believe I may be able to throw some light on the application of Bill 80, in relation to the Toronto and suburban municipalities.

Some query has been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) to representation in Bill 80, and the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) has also suggested that the representation is unequal. In the County Council, of the County of York, as presently constituted, there are twenty-six municipalities. Some of these municipalities are very populous, and others are smaller, but in either case each of the municipalities has been represented by a reeve and deputy reeve, the deputy

reeves having been appointed when municipalities became qualified under the Municipal Act to send a deputy reeve to County Council. Then there have been some of the larger townships which, pursuant to special legislation, have had greater representation than a reeve and deputy reeve. But over the years, Mr. Speaker, I can say that the representation in the County Council of the County of York, which takes in twelve of the municipalities which it is proposed to federate in the plan as set out in Bill 80, has worked, very, very well, and those of us who had the honour of representing some of the urban municipalities, tried our best to solve some of the problems which were presented to County Council through the larger township areas. And in every case, so far as I can recall, they found a satisfactory solution to all these major problems. So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that in so far as the proposals set forth in Bill 80 on the basis of representation are concerned, the several municipalities will be very well pleased and satisfied with the representation as set out in the Bill. I realize fully -- and I know that also do some of the hon. members of this House,-- that there have been press reports of certain representations by certain suburban areas in the area, which have indicated their dissatisfaction to representations. My submissio in that regard is that the representation is representative of the elected representatives, from the local areas, to the federated council, or the

Metropolitan Council, and I believe that as time goes on, if experience shows that representation should be otherwise than is proposed in the Bill, there is nothing to prevent changes being made in the Bill as presently proposed.

Dealing now for a moment, Mr. Speaker, with the question of education: under the Bill, a school board -- metropolitan in its character -- would be created and would administer educational matters at the metropolitan level across the whole of the area, several local boards still continuing to take care of educational problems in their several local areas. That is as it should be. There should be a board of education to look after educational matters, the same as every council, will look after their own matters pertinent to municipal operation.

In this Bill, one of the greatest effects, I suppose, is that the County of York as presently constituted will be divided into two parts, and a new county will be composed of that part of the County of York presently lying north of Steele's Avenue, and the suburban municipality lies to the south of Steele's Avenue will become federated with Toronto into a Metropolitan Council.

One observation I would like to make in that connection is dealing with the matter of assessment. The County of York, as presently constituted, has its assessment broken down in this fashion:

Eighty per cent of the assessment of the County of York now lies within the urban municipalities proposed to federate with Toronto.

Thirteen per cent of the present assessment of the County of York lies in the new county proposed to be set up.

In that new County of York, the northern section of the present county -- there are more than 200 miles of highway operated by the Toronto and York Roads Commission, and one of the major expenditures of the County of York in past years has been for the administration of the highways, through the Toronto and York Roads Commission in the County of York. In the proposed Bill, through the Depa of Highways, considerable aid is afforded to the northern section of the county, or the new county, by the taking over of one of the major roads, the eighth concession of Markham, and making it a provincial highway, and by taking over the present county roads and making them suburban roads. In this manner, these municipalities lying in the County of York will be relieved considerably of their present responsibility, in so far as these highways are concerned, and it will lie completely and solely in their minds, if, as and when any county road may be designated by that county in the northern section.

Dealing with the question of assessment; I would like to say that it is essential the assessment

be put on an equalized basis across the whole of the area in greater Toronto, in order that this plan may function properly, and to that end the suburban municipalities have been re-assessed. Under the Greater Toronto Board Assessment Act of 1950, the City of Toronto itself was re-assessed in 1948, long before the application for amalgamation was made. My information is that the re-assessment of the City of Toronto and the re-assessment of the suburban municipalities is such that all thirteen municipalities will now be re-assessed on a similar and on an equalized basis. It is toward that end that Bill No. 80 brings forward the proposal of making it possible for this federated plan to work, in order to provide essential services applicable to all the municipalities in the area, in each of the individual municipalities.

Dealing with the matter of the County of York -- the northern section; I would like to draw to the attention of the House one fact. In 1950, the County of York purchased a park on Lake Simcoe, comprised of approximately 485 acres. There is still a considerable amount of debenture debt outstanding in relation to that purchase. It was the last large tract of land available for park purposes in the County of York, and it was only after considerable debate in County Council that the land was purchased.

In Bill 80 there is nothing specifically mentioned in relation to this park, although

provision is made for the taking over of existing parks by the metropolitan authorities, and also for the purchasing and setting up of the new parks.

A suggestion I would like to make in this connection is that consideration might be given to taking over the park at Lake Simcoe as a provincial park, because it will undoubtedly be available to and used by the citizens, not only of the City of Toronto, and the suburban areas, but by the citizens of the province of Ontario as a whole.

A word now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the general plan. I would like to say that Bill 80 has come about as the result of an application which was made to the Municipal Board by the City of Toronto for amalgamation, and that was supported by another application from the town of Mimico for the uniformity of certain public services. Some mention has been made in the House this afternoon that amalgamation is presently the only answer, and will ultimately be the answer. With that I cannot agree, and I will tell you why in a few moments. One has only to realize that during the amalgamation hearings the twelve suburban municipalities, excepting only the town of Mimico, adduced evidence in opposition to amalgamation, and one of the chief reasons why amalgamation was opposed was on account of the fact that it would undoubtedly cause the taxes in several suburban municipalities

to rise very, very sharply. The reason I say that is because in a township area which would have been amalgamated with the City of Toronto, but which did not have paved streets, or curbs, or sidewalks or sewers, and which would have been incorporated in the amalgamation, would undoubtedly have gone to the City of Toronto to the amalgamated council, and said:

> "Here, we are being assessed as part of that amalgamated territory, and we demand immediately all of the services you have in the City of Toronto."

If these services were asked for, not by one, but by all twelve municipalities, where would the financial picture rest in all thirteen municipalities? They would be heading for bankruptcy. No doubt about that. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, amalgamation is not practical at the present time. In Bill No. 80 there is absolutely nothing to prevent amalgamation from coming about in due course, if a municipality itself decides that is to be their destiny, and they want it. But the amalgamation scheme, as I say, for the financial reasons alone, is one which would not work, and could not work at the present time.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the County Council plan, -- the set-up of a federated unit -- is not precisely the proposal which was advanced by the suburban municipalities in the amalgamation hearings, but it is tantamount to it. It was

suggested by the suburban municipalities in the amalgamation hearing that the county council plan should be invoked, which would take care of the entire County of York, including the City of Toronto. The federation plan, I would say, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the suburban municipality asked for in essence. They were asking for an over-all authority to administer the affairs of the area, but that each of them retain its own identity, and that is exactly what Bill No. 80 proposes.

(Take H follows)

Each municipality has its right individually to still carry on the affairs of the municipality itself without any difficulty.

Aside from the financial picture dealing with the objections to amalgamation, we found that there were other reasons. In the City of Toronto's application for amalgamation it had been proposed that each of the suburban municipalities would hand over to Toronto in the amalgamated form all of the public utilities, all of their assets, without compensation.

That was one thing the suburban municipalities objected to very, very strenuously, because who was to say that the City of Toronto was the criterion of municipal administration on the one hand as against the suburban municipalities on the other?

What have we got in Bill No. 80? Here is what you have. You have the City of Toronto and all twelve municipalities in the suburban area put on an equal footing; every municipality turns over its assets to the metropolitan council; no one municipality is given any preference in position or any other, so that, as I say to you, Bill No. 80 provides an equality in treatment to all of the municipalities concerned, which amalgamation did not even contemplate.

Mr. Speaker, some mention has been made this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Oliver) as to why the plan proposed in Bill No. 80 will not work, and the suggestion was made that generally speaking, in the municipalities today, we are looking for a reduction in taxes. That is true, municipal councils have been trying for many years to get reductions in taxes, and with the setting up of the Metropolitan Council undoubtedly we are going to increase taxation through the cost of a further body of administration. That is something which will come about over the matter of a year or two, but ultimately, as I said, to you a moment ago, if in the wisdom of the municipalities themselves they decide that a single unit of government can administer the affairs of the area equitably to all, then that third level of government, the Metropolitan Council, can be done away with. It lies entirely within the authority of the municipalities themselves.

It was also suggested that the Metropolitan County Council system as proposed would not work; that it was too slow and too cumbersome. I again say that in my twelve or thirteen years' experience as a member of the York County Council, which is the county affected by this Bill, where we did have some eight or nine representation centres out of the twelve immediately around Toronto actively engaged day by day in the affairs of the County of York, plus all of the rural areas, things worked out very harmoniously and to the benefit of all concerned.

Some of these townships affected in Bill No. 80, such as Etobicoke, East York, and North York, are composite municipalities. They are both rural and urban in their character and some of them are suburban; they are half-and-half in part, but in the County Council of the County of York there was cross section of representation, all the way down the municipal field from rural through to urban, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that my experience in the county council of the County of York, along with other hon. members who have served in that body, is to this effect that it worked there and there is no reason why it will not work here as proposed in Bill No. 80.

Some mention also has been made of the time element. In the so-called "Cumming Report" the proposal was made that there would be a council of nine members all appointed. Bill No. 80 proposes that council shall consist of twenty-five members, all elected except the Chairman who will be appointed for the first two years. Who knows about the local municipality concerned than the reeve or the mayor of that municipality? Nobody. Consequently I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that Bill No. 80 as proposed in regard to representation goes right down to the democratic root of representation, in setting up a plan for the full scale operation and solution of the problem which we have before us today.

There is an observation, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to make on two of the items in the Bill. In the first place I would like to draw your attention to subsection 4 of section 109 of the Bill, which has to do with the matter of transportation.

Initially in the suburban area when these areas were being built up, the Toronto Transportation Commission did not feel it could go out into those areas and build those areas up, without being subsidized through the local municipalities. The net result was that private enterprise, private bus operators, went into these suburban areas, provided transportation, and as a result of that transportation having been provided, those areas did build up to their present status. Subsection 4 of section 109 of the Bill which state that no compensation shall be afforded to those bus companies for goodwill, to me seems a little bit harsh.

I do not hold any brief for any bus company or transit authority operating in the suburban area, but I do say this, that much of the successful operation and influx of population into those suburban areas was brought about through private enterprise and the operation of those bus industries providing transportation into those areas, and I do not think it is fair that those bus operators should be set aside and told in so many words by any

transit authority,--- or that legislation should be introduced whereby the transit authority could tell them,--- "We are going to take over your bus operations and we are only going to pay you so much for the bus and so much for your actual chattels without anything being given in return for good will. One cannot help but realize the tremendous amount of sacrifice and investment these operators have put into that particular enterprise.

The second section which I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is section 125, subsection 5. It deals with the matter of amounts being allowed to local municipalities for pupil attendance. The proposal in subsection 2 is, as we are now familiar with it, that $150 should be allowed for elementary students, $250 for academic students, and $300 for vocational students. In municipalities like North York and in Etobicoke, and in East York, are larger township areas which are particularly affected by this part of the Bill. We know that the population is increasing in those areas month by month today, and that those municipalities today, in 1953, have to provide school accommodation for a greater number of pupils than they did back in 1952. The grants from the Province are based upon the attendance figures of 1952 In other words, the grants are one year behind, but the expenditures as far as the municipality concerned in providing school accommodation, are one year ahead. It has to be, in order to

provide the accommodation for the students.

The suggestion which I would like to make at this stage is that perhaps in these expanding townships some additional relief might be afforded for the first year or two until these municipalities become a little more stabilized in their school attendance population, in order that it will not affect the local budget to the extent that it does at the present time.

Some suggestion has also been made that Bill No. 80 is putting off this matter of amalgamation until the time when there will be such a resistance created against amalgamation that it just will not do at all. Mention also was made as to why fire and police were not included at this particular time.

In reply, Mr. Speaker, may I say that, as in all legislation which is pertinent to a heavy and a deep problem, it requires a great deal of thought in order to set up any kind of legislation, and when one examines Bill No. 80 and reads through the 227 sections of that Bill, one cannot help but realize that there has been a tremendous amount of thinking, study, and effort already put into the drafting of that Bill. There is no suggestion or proposal today that Bill No. 80 is absolutely perfect; in fact, I do not think any one in this House regards it as being absolutely perfect, but it does at least attempt to face the problem which affects the municipalities in the Toronto area, and I do think

the government is to be commended for having the courage to stand up and face the metropolitan problems such as are confronting the people of this area today.

The fact is that next year, and maybe in the course of the next six months, situations will develop which will show the necessity or the advantage offered in amending Bill No. 80 in whole or in part, or adding other sections to it, whereby ultimately it will be of great benefit and great help to the people of the Toronto Metropolitan Area.

MR. E. L. WEAVER (St.David): I move the adjournment of the debate on Bill No. 80.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the hon. the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

(Take I follows)

HON. LOUIS P. CECILE (Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the opportunity has come to make some remarks to the House at this time. I had not anticipated speaking to the hon. members this early in the session as there are still departmental estimates to be dealt with when they come up. At that time I plan to give a review of the Travel and Publicity affairs in detail. In view of a particular news story which appeared in the Toronto Telegram, Tuesday, March 3rd, however, I deem it most appropriate to make some remarks, on one of Ontario's vital industries. There may not seem to be anything new in what I am about to say but I feel that public relations is one aspect that we are prone to forget, and at times it would seem a review of our position is in order.

The Telegram story concerns an address which Dr. Charles E. Phillips, Professor of Education at the Ontario College of Education made before the Toronto Board of Trade. I did not hear the good doctor's address, nor have I read a complete transcript of it, but if what he says as reported in the Telegram is true, it is time we Ontario people faced up to the facts.

The article on the front page of the second section was captioned thus:

"School View - See Yanks as Crude Boastful - U.S. Opinions of us Similar".

The lead went on as follows:

"Americans are funny characters, crude, boastful, loud-mouthed and think too much of themselves."

It further states:

"This unflattering portrait of the average American, sums up the attitude of many Canadian high school students, according to Dr. Charles E. Phillips, Professor of Education at the Ontario College of Education."

Now I am not concerned too much with the views of our high school students, whether they be for or against the business in which I am engaged, but what I am concerned with is where they get such ideas.

Generalities are always somewhat dangerous and usually founded on half truths, unreliable sources or ill-considered opinions. I am sure that every hon. member in the House agrees that to dub a hundred and seventy million Americans as all loud-mouthed, funny, crude, overly boastful and self-centred, is utter nonsense. It is also equally nonsenscial to so dub the 17 million Americans who cross our borders to visit with us; in most cases Canadians like the Americans and I can assure you that they in turn, with a few isolated exceptions, certainly have a high opinion of us.

I noticed that Dr. Phillips, in voicing his views for the Toronto Board of Trade, and acting as spokesman for the high school students, went on to say that efforts were being made to correct such wild ideas through an organization known as the Canada-United States Committee on Education. This Committee, according to the newspaper story, was formed in 1944 -- nine years ago -- and this year Dr. Phillips is Pro-Chairman.

I have little doubt that Dr. Phillips has his work cut out if after nine years of effort current opinion studies in our secondary schools here in Ontario are still at such a low ebb. I can sympathize with the good doctor and his Committee, because we in Ontario in the travel industry find that one of the most difficult tasks facing us is bringing home to Ontario people themselves the value of our tourist industry and the value of public relations in keeping it at a high level of prosperity.

Nearly a hundred years ago, the great Disraeli said, "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct" and he also said, "Individualities may form communities, but it is institutions alone that can create a nation".

Both these opinions I commend for consideration for the entire adult and sober thinking

population of Ontario. More particuarly, may I suggest that those whose duty it is, either as parents or teachers, to guide the thinking of our young people, ought to look into the mirror once in a while.

In our zeal for things Canadian in this country I am in full accord, let no one make any mistake about that. One of the things Americans who are tourist visitors to our province complain of most is the fact that in certain sections of the country we are "too much Americanized". On many and many an occasion I have protested against the policy of some Canadian business people to fly the American Stars and Stripes on every occasion in order, as they think, lure American trade. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The reason that Ontario is the locality most visited by Americans is not that they want to see something that they can walk down their own main street and see, but they want to see Canadians as they live, as they act, as they work, as they really are. I am for things Canadian. The Canadian to me also means a person of manners, and people with manners don't go around insulting their neighbours, let alone their best customers. Unfortunately, even the views of immature people are sometimes misconstrued in the United States, and such

a news story could cause thousands and thousands of dollars worth of adverse publicity, in certain quarters. I can tell you that our job is tough enough to maintain the pace that we have set for ourselves and for you. After all, an industry which produces almost a quarter of a billion dollars in new money each year is a pretty important business to the economy of this or any other province. And that is the figure which I believe, and conservatively, represents the annual revenue from tourists within our borders. Most of these as you know come from the United States.

As you know, Ontario has just experienced in 1952, its seventh record-breaking travel year. While final figures are still incomplete, we can say without hesitation that never before have so many tourist automobiles crossed into Ontario from the United States on permits entitling them to stays of from 48 hours to 6 months. This is the major segment of our travel industry and it has been consistently on the rise for the last several years.

You will pardon me, I know, Mr. Speaker, if I take some credit on behalf of our Department for at least a part of the promotional activities which have made these record-breaking years possible.

It is worthy of note that it is just seven years since Travel and Publicity was established as a separate Department of this Government. In each of these seven years, since 1946, our advertising has been more productive than in any preceding year.

In 1952, Ontario travel advertising in the United States produced more enquiries than ever before -- and significantly the percentage of advertisement produced enquiries as against general enquiries was greater, a point which proves conclusively that without this advertising our tourist business would be on the wane, instead of on the uptrend.

(PAGE I-7 FOLLOWS)

In contrast to this, Canadian enquiries (and we spent just as much money as before in other Provinces of Canada in an attempt to lure tourists) slipped 16%. In view of this, I ask hon. Members of this House if there is any reason outside of a deliberate attempt to sabotage our tourist industry, for people in any position to go out of their way to hurl insults at our best customers on the one hand and then expect them to come over here and enjoy themselves on their vacations on the other. The 94-year old T. Eaton Co. did not build their business on that sort of thing, nor did any other successful merchandising enterprise, and I tell you frankly that we in Ontario are engaged in selling travel in the biggest merchandising field that I know of at the present time. Huge amounts of money and effort are being expended on every hand to capture more and more of the lucrative $12 billion dollar American travel market.

It is significant that the United States Department of Commerce recently issued a report which showed that spending by Americans outside their own country in 1952 reached almost a billion dollars. It has been pointed out by numerous surveys that 2/5ths of American spending outside their country was spent in Canada. This, therefore, would give Canada a tourist revenue from the United States of something in the neighbourhood of $400 million, and I am sorry if this

figure seems much higher than we are credited with in other quarters; it does, however, correspond very closely percentagewise with figures which we set from our own provincial surveys. I will have more to say on that subject in a moment or two.

In the matter of mail enquiries the total in 1952 stood at an all time high level. I am happy to say that the first two months of this year indicate that even those figures are liable to be surpassed in this current year, and would also seem to forecast that we stand on the brink of our Eighth Record Year. Prospects this year are making enquiries about vacations far earlier as well as in greater numbers than ever before. Up to the end of February we have a total of 17,878 mail enquiries already which is an increase of 3,807 enquiries over the year 1952 --- 27 percent. ahead of last year at this time.

Ontario's fifteen Official Tourist Reception Centres established new high marks for patronage during their 1952 season, and the increase here has been steady each year since 1946. Last year the tremendous total of 582,802 visitors took advantage of the many facilities found at these Centres located at key border points between Kenora in the West and Hawkesbury in the East.

Later on in the Session I propose to deal more fully with the Reception Centres and with our future plans when our Departmental Estimates are presented and at this time I will not burden the House with a resume of these figures. But I do want to point out that Reception Centres are a very valuable source of information to us in formulating our promotional plans, and in this respect, for the last two years we have made a big sample of visitor opinion and spending habits at these Centres.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced last year a report of our findings with respect to the survey made of 1951 traffic. We are busily engaged at the present time in tabulating returns from 2,600 questionnaires mailed out to the home addresses of visitors who have appeared at our Reception Centres. The mailing of these questionnaires was done on the most scientific basis. The percentage of intake from each State was calculated and questionnaires mailed in that proportion and they were equally divided wherever possible among the various Reception Centres in accordance with the traffic. Returns are also being tabulated very carefully by States and so far I can say that the percentage of return is very high in comparison to most advertising samples of this type. And I can also say that the percentage return is following

very closely the pattern established in the mailing, so that what we get as a result, will be a true picture of the entire tourist industry as a whole, as far as it effects this Province.

In most respects tourist spending habits and staying habits coincided very closely with that of last year, and therefore with the increased traffic and such other factors as the increased value of the Canadian dollar, we are confident in predicting that we had at least a 2½ million dollar increase in our tourist income during 1952.

Reports which you might have heard that tourists were staying for shorter periods and spending less, which came from some quarters last year, we find unfounded. The number of days averaged by tourist vicitors who came by motor car into Ontario in 1951 was 6.3 days per car.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr.Speaker, I am enjoying the address by the hon Minister (Mr.Cecile) very much but I would like to ask a question, if I may. Did the difference in the exchange on the money between the two countries have any effect on the tourist industry last year?

HON. MR. CECILE: If the hon. member (Mr. Houck) will bear with me, I was just coming to that very point. This year the average stay was 6.1 days per car, which as you see is practically the same.

Spending we find is up from last year. In 1951 the average tourist, according to our studies, spent $7.76 per day, whereas our figures this year 1952 show that his average spending was $8.25 or an increase of 49 cents per tourist per day. This would probably be accounted for almost entirely by the fact that in 1951 the American dollar commanded a five cent premium in most places throughout Ontario. Whereas in 1952 the situation was almost reversed and the American dollar at times was at a five per cent discount. Thus it cost the American tourist almost ten per cent more to vacation in Ontario in 1952 than it did in the previous year. It will also be remembered that right at the outset of our best tourist months a crippling steel strike took place in the United States, and this undoubtedly affected our intake to a great extent, and in the Fall our hunting season was almost non-existent from the standpoint of the American, since he was unable to return home with any of his kill if it happened to be clovenhoofed, and of course the deer hunting American is by far the most numerous of the nimrods who come over each Fall. We also had our tourist season lopped off by a full week, through the position of Labour Day coming on September 1st. There seems to be no other reason for the curtailment of our tourist season at Labour Day, other than the fact that schools open on the following Monday in most localities.

We have been giving a great deal of thought to this problem of lengthening our tourist season and many agencies are keen proponents of the plan to have Labour Day moved back in to September by two weeks, in other words, Labour Day falling on the third Monday in September instead of the first Monday. This view is gaining momentum in various places and those who are the most vigorous advocates of it are beginning to have hopes that it will eventually come about. There is actually no reason why September should not be the equal of July and August for tourist traffic. The weather in September in Ontario is ideal. Fishing, too, is very much better usually than in the very hot days in summer. And in many cases vacations are less costly at that time.

tThe average expenditure per person per trip in 1951 was just under $49, in 1952, our tabulations to date show that the spending per person per trip into Ontario is $62.25. The exchange factor which I previously mentioned accounts for this rather startling increase.

One of the simplest ways to increase our tourist business, and a lot less costly than securing new tourists, is in increasing the length of their stay. It is interesting to note that 76 per cent of our tourists spend less than four days in the Province, and yet at the same time our surveys show that 73 per cent of Ontario's visitors tell

us that they have a total of from 14 to 21 days annual vacation. Only 10 per cent of our visitors spend from two to three weeks in the Province. In other words, the tourist potential of Ontario is greater than it has ever been. If we could get those who spend only one day in our province to stay for two days we would automatically increase our tourist business by 13 per cent. Similarly, if we can get our one and two day people to spend three days each in the Province, we would increase it a further 15 per cent, in other words, 28 per cent gain in tourist traffic by increasing the stay of one and two-day visitors alone. That in nice round figures would probably mean at least $50,000,000 more in the pockets of Ontario people. That would figure out to be about $10 for every man, woman and child in the Province. It doesn't work out quite that way, of course, nut eventually some portion of every tourist dollar affects everyone in the Province. That is very easily proved. Our surveys show that ou· of the American tourist travel dollar (this refers, of course, to the automobile tourist and he makes up about 90 per cent of our total intake) - and I think for the interest of our members these figures should be on the record - 11.6 cents goes for gas, oil, car repairs and transportation generally, 49.4 cents of the tourist dollar goes for accommodation and food, 35 cents out of the tourist dollar goes for consumer purchases - purchases in the retail stores,

purchases for amusement and miscellaneous items of all types. For fishing licences, boats, guides and other outdoor recreation he spends seven cents out of his tourist dollar.

MR. SALSBERG: How much for liquor?

HON. MR. CECILE: I am afraid I have not got that.

MR. SALSBERG: Some statement on the subject was made earlier in the session.

HON. MR. CECILE: It amounts to quite a bit, I imagine the bigger part of the $42,000,000 the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) heard about.

Undoubtedly, the tourist industry puts more actual dollars and cents into the pockets of the ordinary citizen than any other industry on the calendar as it can readily be seen that the categories which share the dollar include almost our entire working force, and in addition, the professional people of our province depend for their income on a prosperous working force and the farmers.

Direct taxes which go into the Provincial Treasury are included in tourist spending and my colleague, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), knows full well that tourists are heavy contributors to his revenues through gasoline taxes. According to the questionnaires returned by our tourists, the United States motorists rolled up almost a billion miles over Ontario highways in 1952 and in the process contributed about four and a half million

dollars directly to the Provincial Treasury in the form of gasoline taxes. These figures are the result of a tabulation of the returns from 1188 of our questionnaires which were spread all over the entire United States. It was revealed that the average motor tourist drove 599 miles within the Provincial borders and these figures were calculated on the basis of days of stay in the Province. Last year tourist travelling was not so accurately computed as it has been with this questionnaire, but at the s ame time, 1951 figures showed that tourist travel was about 590 miles per car which compares very closely with the results of thisyear's study. The sample this year is particularly good since almost 91 per cent of the questionnaires returne answered the query as to how many miles they had cover within the province.

What do our tourists like to do when they come to Ontario ? Well, by far the greatest portion of them, namely 84 per cent are primarily interested in motoring or sightseeing and in such motor trips, 41 per cent say they like to visit national or provincial parks; 35 per cent say they like city visiting; 35 per cent more say they seek out historical shrines and battlefields and other such attractions and interests. 34 per cent say their chief interest in Ontario is in angling, and it is in this class that those camps which are under the jurisdiction of my hon. frien

the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Gemmell) depend, these anglers, plus another 26 per cent who name outdoor recreation as one of the feature attractions for them in Ontario. There are over 1,400 of these camps in northern and northwestern Ontario and their investment in property, labour, food, equipment, guides, runs into the millions and gives employment to thousands including again our Ontario farmers who produce the food to feed this annual invading army of tourists. Thirteen per cent say their chief interest is in visiting with friends or relatives in Ontario and a further 15 per cent say that they are very much interested in the institutions and churches which abound throughout our Province. Five per cent come here to enjoy the facilities of our resort hotels and the social side of life and the same percentage say they come here for a golfing vacation. Other attractions noted by five per cent of our visitors were hunting, photography, shopping, canoeing, camping exploring, observing wildlife, visiting mines, dancing and social life, the geology of our country, our agriculture, boating, motor-boat racing, swimming, hockey and our winter ski-ing.

In other words, if we in Ontario appoint ourselves as salesmen for our country and observe the first law of any salesman - to know what we have to sell and be able to sell it - we can all

play an important part in the development of this most important industry.

As I have pointed out throughout this discussion here today, a good deal of our tourist business depends entirely on public relations, which is, after all, dealing with people. I always like the simple definition of public relations which is credited to a Mr. John Heron; it is said to be "establishment of a policy of good doing, then doing it, then telling about it". This is the platform on which our Department stands but we must have the whole-hearted co-operation of all the people of Ontario and it would seem from checking over the comments of only a few of these questionnaires returned, that the people do enjoy themselves in Ontario and think very highly of both we Canadians and the facilities which we offer here.

It is highly satisfactory to note that 96 per cent of the people who visited our reception centres last year on their return home rated the friendliness and hospitality of Canadians as either good or outstanding, with most of them voting for the outstanding category.

(Page I 18 follows)

Ninety-eight per cent of Americans rate our police officers as good or outstanding, and with a majority voting for the high mark.

Ninety-three per cent of our visitors said our Customs and Immigration officers were marvels of politeness, efficiency and helpfulness, and again voted outstanding and good in an overwhelming majority.

Yes, in general, Americans think we are a pretty fair sort and the fact that so many of them return year after year is indicative of the fact that they like us.

We here in Ontario are in an enviable position. Of the total population of the United States of approximately 160,000,000 people, most of them live in the heavily populated States which rim the borders of Ontario and the Great Lakes. These are the highly industrialized States of the Union, where most of the 63,000,000 people in the United States civilian labour force live. I point out to you that today, largely as a result of union activities, 47,000,600 of these people now get regular annual vacations with pay. These people are all potential vacationists to our Province because here exists the nearest foreign land and a vacation spot that they can all reach

with very little trouble, and where they usually can enjoy themselves at less cost than they can at home. I would point out to you also that there are 46,500,000 Americans outside the labour force -- professional people, farmers, merchants, school teachers, etc. -- all of whom are ideal prospects for Ontario vacations. In the United States one of every four persons drives a motor car, and manufacturers' schedules call for five million vehicles to be produced in 1953.

Out own Department is not alone in attempting to attract more and more of this tremendous travel market to Ontario. I should like to pay tribute to those local agencies, Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade, resort associations and the individual operators, who, through their own money and efforts are doing such a tremendous job in the promotion and development of Ontario's travel industry.

The contribution of these organizations towards our record-breaking tourist years has been most whole-hearted.

Perhaps I might explain here to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of our Department in promotion activity has been to do the job of the Province as a whole. As you

know, there are many sections and many different interests which benefit from our tourists, and it must be left to local interests to promote their own particular project. There is ample evidence that they have been in the main successful, and I would say to the people of Ontario, through hon. members here, that if they want more travel business in their area, the answer to that lies within themselves. Travel business is like anything else; it must be promoted and it must be sold. Very rarely does it come by itself. The first and best salesman that you can have for your area is a satisfied customer. He is the one who goes home and sings your praises at no cost to you, and the results of his efforts have a greater impact on our tourist business than any other factor which we might employ in the promotion. Conversely, he can go home and tell your faults, too; and make no mistake about it, if there are faults in your tourist promotion setup, they will come to light.

Although January is hardly a significant month in the tourist business, since almost 80 per cent of our tourist motor car trade comes between May 1st and September 30th, it is nevertheless indicative of the fact that the tourist

business in this Province is still on the upgrade. In the months just past -- January and February, 1953 -- there were 23,484 United States tourist cars through Ontario ports on travellers' vehicle permits, representing an increase of 3,662 vehicles over the same period in 1952. We stand, therefore, as I said before, on the brink of what might be our eighth consecutive record-breaking tourist year.

Such authorities as Holiday Magazine predict that records will again fall in 1953, as travel-hungry United States motorists hit the highway and other tourists go by air, rail and the sea lanes to see their own country and the rest of the world. "Never before," says the latest Holiday Newsletter, "have all the omens and all the economic and other factors which cause people to travel been so favourable." Just what proportion of this business comes to Ontario is not only up to our Department but to everyone in this Province. It is a prize worth fighting for and it is a prize worthy of our best efforts even if, in the light of world conditions, we consider it a step in the establishment of further cementing of friendly relations between nations as an example to the World.

(J-1 follows)

MR. THOMAS PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Porter, that the following hon. members be added to the following Standing Committees:

To the Committee on Game and Fish, Mr. Myers.

To the Committee on Lands and Forests, Mr. Cathcart.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will continue with the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:07 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - -

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XIX

Tuesday, March 10, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M. C. Davies,

Speaker.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Tuesday, March 10, 1953.
3:00 o'clock p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Among the schools we have with us today are Huron Street School, Norway Public School, Notre Dame Academy from Waterdown, Essex County School, visitors from Northern Vocational School, and their guests from the city of Rochester, New York.

I understand the visitors from Rochester are to be here for several days getting a glimpse of the beauty of Toronto and the advantages which this city offers. They may not quite compare with the advantages of my home city of Windsor, but at the same time we sincerely hope that the students from our neighboring State of New York will find their stay in Toronto, and particularly their visit with us this afternoo of great interest and benefit.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT : Mr. Nickle, from the Standing Committee on Private Bills, presents the Committees third Report as follows:

"Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:-

Bill No. 6 -An Act respecting the Riverside Cemetery Company of Port Arthur.

Bill No. 24- An Act respecting The Lakeshore District Board of Education.

Bill No. 33 - An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children.

"Your Committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:-

Bill No. 16 - An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill No. 20 - An Act respecting the City of London.

"Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 33, An Act respecting The Hospital for Sick Children.

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) W. M. Nickle,

Chairman."

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): I beg

to present the Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario for the year 1952.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

May I, before the orders of the day, now that most of the hon. members are in their places, say that I am sure the Hon. Provincial Treasurer will be interested to find that there are about twenty members who do not expect or do not want to be paid on March 31st. We have distributed T.D. forms and it is impossible for us to arrange payment until these forms are in.

May I request, respectfully, that the hon. members who have not yet turned in their T.D. forms, do so at once, or I am afraid I shall have to assume that you just want to make a contribution of your indemnity to the Provincial Treasurer. If you have not your form on your desk, ask for one from the page boys and fill it in this afternoon so it will be taken care of, and you will be assured of your indemnity.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I very much appreciate the attitude of the hon. members of the House, twenty of them, no doubt, who are helping me to achieve a surplus which I hope to be able to announce on Thursday next, and it would be very helpful, sir, if they will just continue their present attitude and hold back their T.D. forms.

I would like to inform the House that it may be necessary to convene the House tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock instead of 3 o'clock. If it is

necessary to make that motion, sir, I will so move before we rise tonight. It may turn out that it is not necessary to do so.

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to say that sitting in this Chamber today is a minister from another province, the Hon. Norman Buchanan, the Minister of Mines for our sister province of New Brunswick. We are very glad to have Mr. Buchanan here. It is a very great pleasure to have visiting us occasionally ministers from other provinces, and also from the Federal Government.

I beg to table answers to questions 63 and 72.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the hon. The Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session.

(A-5 follows)

MR. THOMAS PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, several hon. members have commenced their addresses this year with a reference to the coronation of our gracious Queen Elizabeth. I trust her reign will be recorded in history as an era of peace and prosperity for all mankind. It is also my hope that our Prime Minister, accompanied by Mrs. Frost, will represent us on that occasion. We know Ontario people who are present will be proud of their official representative.

I also sincerely congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply to the address, without referring in detail to the subject matter of their speeches. They both made notable contributions to the proceedings of this House.

Reference has also been made to the disastrous floods which overtook the east coast of England as well as so much of the coast of Holland. That was only a few weeks ago, but it has faded from the headlines, though I hope not from our memories.

In Huron we are particularly interested because, during the past few years, thousands of Dutch people hav settled in our County and are proving themselves, for the most part, worthy citizens.

The Warden of the County immediately initiated measures to organize a Relief Committee and it has been hard work. Latest figures indicate that about $10,000 has been raised for the relief of these grief-stricken people.

These Dutch people are valuable New Canadians -

thrifty, law-abiding, industrious, and religious. Many of them, in the course of a few years, have saved enough money to purchase their own farms. They have brought with them new ideas and new skills which, I am sure, will be for the good of our land.

Their presence in our midst is bound to have its effect on our way of life. The stores reflect the change. Stocks of goods are carried which are typically Dutch and which, of course, are also being bought and used by other Canadians.

The County of Huron has always been regarded as a purely agricultural county, but that is rapidly changing. There is evidence that oil is to be found throughout the county, and the day may not be far distant when Huron County will be studded with oil derricks.

The presence of two large Air Force training establishments within our borders is also having a very great impact on the life of the County.

(Take B follows)

Decentralization of Industry

Huron County is far from being over-populated and there is great need for new industries. There must be many sound reasons why big business continues to locate in already overcrowded areas, but I believe with all my heart that more industries could be profitably located in smaller places.

We are all very conscious of the huge program of national defence -- defence, in the first place, against air raids with atomic weapons. Nobody knows whether our defences would hold. If they are penetrated, we have certainly provided the enemy with some prime targets.

I want to suggest that our local authorities should work hand in hand with the Industrial Promotion Branch of our Department of Planning and Development.

Last year, representatives of that Branch held a conference with the mayors and reeves and other officials of the County of Huron, and I believe measures were outlined at that time which may bring results. Small towns cannot bear the expense of a promotion department to attract industry; however, they could organize on a county basis.

The urban municipalities in Huron are

exploring the feasibility of this plan and I hope it will be pressed to a successful conclusion. If the towns in the county would unite their efforts, employ a full-time publicity man, assemble the advantages of each municipality, and go after business, I am sure it would have beneficial results.

Disabled Persons' Act

It is not my purpose to laud every Department of the Government, although I could say much along this line. However, there is one piece of legislation enacted by this Government which has brought joy to many a home and made life easier than it would otherwise have been.

I refer to the Disabled Persons' Assistance Act. I believe more people have come to me and commended the Government for this piece of legislation than for anything else since I became a member of this House.

I draw the attention of the House to the title -- "Assistance Act." It does not entirely support a person these days, but it certainly does what was intended, gives help to those who are physically or mentally handicapped.

I must take issue with my good friend the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas), when he speaks of the restrictions. On the other hand,

the liberal interpretation placed upon the meaning of the Act has been most gratifying to me. Many have been declared eligible who, in my opinion, would not have qualified a year ago. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) has been blessed many times for this humanitarian piece of legislation.

Municipal Affairs

I want to repeat what I have said several times in this House. Our number one municipal problem is revenue to meet the ever-increasing needs of our growing communities. Real estate cannot bear the burden. The Bill respecting grants to municipalities, which was introduced this Session, is a step in the right direction.

Grants in aid are wrong in principle, and I welcome this new advanced approach to the subject. We all know what is happening across the Province at the municipal level. It is: "Let's get this, or that . . . The Province will pay 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 50 per cent of the cost." It is only human nature, and although this plan must be continued for some time, I welcome the new principle which has been adopted.

Why measure the needs of a municipality by its assessment, especially when the methods employed

have been so varied? Is it not much better to use as a yardstick the number of human beings in a given area? My hope is that the new principle will be extended and that some system of checks and balances be adapted to schools, roads, hospitals, etc.

In so far as the older part of Ontario is concerned, I think the number of people in a township and the miles of roads within its boundaries might be a better yardstick on which to make road grants than the system now employed. This suggestion may have many weaknesses, but it might be explored.

Many of our municipal difficulties could be solved if there was a real disposition at Ottawa to come to grips with this problem and surrender some tax fields so that the provinces would be in a position to work out new deals with the next lower level of government, and directly lower taxes on real estate.

The most important part of the budget speech by the hon. Minister of Finance a few weeks ago was not regarding lower income tax rates or the abolition of the radio licence fee; it was his intimation that there was no intention on his part to give up any taxing fields at the moment.

Toronto Bill

Coming as I do from a constituency some distance removed from Toronto, I have been most interested in the problem facing the people of this area, without having the benefit of firsthand acquaintance with the facts.

I have not been too impressed with the dire results which have been predicted by both sides if their ideas were not carried out in the proposed legislation. My faith in our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has again been vindicated and I do like the manner in which he has approached this difficult task.

I like cartoons. One which appeared in a Toronto daily was very much to the point, and was worth a page of reading or hours of talk. It depicted a man standing in the basement of a new house. The foundation was prepared, services were piped into the cellar, and the onlookers were there to give advice. The man in the cellar was labelled "The Government of Ontario -- the onlookers, "The Toronto and District Municipalities." The Government, holding out some plans, is saying, "There's the foundation, here are the plans; go ahead now and build your house."

That is what is proposed. This Bill is

the foundation and the plans are flexible enough to permit the moving of a window or the building of an extra cupboard by mutual consent.

We must all be impressed with the fairness of the hon. Prime Minister with respect to this Bill. In all the years I have been in this House I have never seen such a desire to keep an open mind and accept recommendations which will meet reasonable objections. If the new Council approaches the task in the same spirit, there can be no doubt of the outcome.

Hospitals

We hear of the ever-increasing need for more hospital accommodation and the difficulties of providing it, due principally to the high cost of building. Let me give you an example of what can be done where there is a will to do it.

The Town of Exeter, with a population of some 2,600, decided a hospital was needed. An architect was engaged, plans were drawn and approved by the Department of Health, and tenders called for, but the lowest bid received was somewhere near $325,000. One Hundred thousand dollars had been raised by voluntary subscription in the town and vicinity, but, even with grants from the County, Province and Dominion, it was felt that the

cost was prohibitive.

The group of public-spirited citizens who comprised the committee decided to build it by day labour. They hired a local contractor to supervise the job, bought the materials themselves, and set to work. Four weeks ago, after eight or nine months of intense activity, its doors were opened to receive patients. The cost was about $225,000, or approximately $100,000 below the estimate.

I am proud to say this here, and I hope it will serve as an example to other small places who may contemplate a similar project.

Cemeteries

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr.Stewart) broight to the attention of the House a few days ago a situation which calls for corrective action immediately. I refer to the growth of cemeteries operated for profit. The public usually think of cemeteries as last resting places for their dead, and associate their ownership with a church or the municipality, but a new plan has crept into being.

Promoters move in, a plot of land is secured outside the city and a corps of salesmen proceed to sell graves from door to door, on a pre-need plan. You pay so much down, the balance

in regular monthly instalments. This is being done on a big scale. You buy a few square feet of land, and pay almost the price of a building lot for it. You are told the farm will be nicely landscaped, etc., and that perpetual care of your plot is assured. It will be a memorial park, and beautiful photographs are presented to sell the idea.

The Cemeteries Act calls for 15 per cent of the purchase price of a lot being placed in a trust fund to care for it in perpetuity. Anyone who has any knowledge of the cost of operating a cemetery knows it costs more than that to adequately care for its maintenance.

For instance, the Toronto General Burial Trust places 50 per cent of the purchase price in a perpetual care fund. The cemetery in my own home town places a similar amount in a trust fund, but even the interest on that amount gives them nothing to spare.

I shall not bother you with figures, but those of you who are mathematically inclined can figure out the potential profits when one hundred acres of farmland are converted into cemetery lots at possibly $4 a square foot, after making due allowance for roadways, shrubbery, etc. The

potential profit on one hundred acres is over $7 million. In addition, hundreds of young people, particularly, will not complete their payments and will thus lose all they have paid.

I suggest that the Cemeteries Act must have more adequate provision made for enforcement; that a larger percentage of the purchase price of a lot be placed in a perpetual care fund; that annual financial returns must be made to the Department, and penalties provided for failure to do so. Greater safeguards must surround the use of trust funds.

The Assessment Act should be amended to permit the assessment of cemeteries operated for profit, and also provision made for imposing a business tax.

If something is not done immediately, we will have more abandoned cemeteries, possibly in the path of an expanding community, and, in addition to being an eyesore, they will impose further liabilities on the shoulders of the municipalities.

Dairy Farming

The dairy farmer is an important factor in the agricultural life of this country. It is my purpose to draw to the attention of this House the

grave threat that exists to his business at the present time.

It is unnecessary to emphasize his importance, not only to the agricultural community but to the nation as a whole. Practically everybody uses the products of the dairy farmer in one form or another. It may be whole milk, butter, cheese, or concentrated milk, and it would be a disaster in many ways if his business was made so unprofitable that many would be forced out of this type of farming.

The dairy farmer is faced with unrestricted competition at this moment, and I appeal to everyone in this House to support any Government measure which gives him some protection.

I do not need to mention that this threat comes from the use of edible oils in the manufacture of foodstuffs which compete with dairy products. Urban as well as rural members may well support any legislation of this nature.

The curtailment of the farm implement business, with resultant idle factories, will inevitably follow a shrinkage in farm income, to mention only one industry which will be directly affected.

The dairy farmer in this instance is not asking anything unreasonable. He is only asking

what almost every form of industry enjoys today -- protection from outside competition to maintain the Canadian standard of living. Export markets have almost disappeared. Hugh surpluses are being accumulated. I quote from the London Free Press of March 3:

> "The Federal Government has decided to buy 10,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk from the Canadian dairy industry in an effort to reduce a commercial stockpile that has doubled in the space of a year."

Hon. members for the eastern parts of the Province can tell you the situation with respect to cheese. I cannot go into every detail of the threat to this important industry, but it is very real.

Our economy at the present time is supported to a very large extent by defence spending. Defence industries are, in effect, subsidized, and are not subject to outside competition. Wages and profits are protected in the fullest sense.

As the representative of a very extensive dairying community, I support the claim of the dairy farmers for a ban on the manufacture and sale of synthetic dairy products, in so far as it is within the jurisdiction of the Government

of this Province. Personally, if I want a drink of milk I want it to come from the cow, not from a cocoanut.

In conclusion, I believe we are living in the greatest era in the history of this Province. It presents us with a great challenge. I believe this Government is facing its duties and trying to meet the problems with which we are confronted, and I am happy to be privileged to share in this great work.

(C-1 follows)

HON. PHILIP T. KELLY (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, if, three years ago, we had been asked to express an opinion as to the principal services in the Mines Department can offer people engaged in the mining industry in this great province, we should almost certainly have placed at the top of the list the information made available through geological surveys.

Possibly our highly-trained and devoted staff of geologists and the work they do still deservedly hold honour of place, in the Department, but I should be inclined to be less dogmatic about such an assertion now than I would have been two or three years ago.

It seems to boil down to the old question of which came first, the egg or the chicken. Without geologists there can be no survey and so, except in very rare cases, no development of our great mineral resources. On the other hand, without means of access to the vast areas of Northern Ontario, wherein lie hidden hoards of mineral wealth, there can be no survey, no means of getting equipment into operations and no means of getting the ore out.

It is only within the last two years that facilitating such means of access has become a primary concern of the Department of Mines. In

1951, this House first approved an appropriation of one million dollars for the construction of Mining Access Roads as a means of opening up promising new territories and encouraging prospecting and exploration and at the same time, in many cases, giving established companies the opportunity to expand which could come only with reasonably good communication facilities.

A second million dollars was approved in the budget for 1952, and again this year our estimates call for another million for the same purpose.

I can think of no way, in which public money could be invested to better advantage in the interest of the public as a whole.

Through the instrumentality of these roads great tracts of otherwise inaccessible territory have been thrown open to exploration and development. Important finds have been made by prospectors who, without the means of access provided by these roads, could never have got in to make a thorough examination. Mines which had struggled along, dissipating much of their resources in expensive air transport of supplies, have been enabled to increase their output -- and get the ore to the market -- as adequate road facilities were made available.

Moreover, I should like to point out that, while the development of mines and of our mineral resources is the primary purpose of my Department, the benefits derived from these roads are by no means confined to mining interests.

This province has a very important stake in the development of its mineral resources, in the benefit provided by the profitable employment of its citizens and in the profits accruing to the province, through the operation of its Mining Tax Act. If private capital is to be encouraged to spend its funds in exploring promising mineral areas, the province should share the hazards of exploration, at least to the extent of providing means of access to them. It is realized, of course, that not all of the deposits explored will prove of commercial value and to a certain extent some of these ventures, including the investment in access roads, will appear to be unsuccessful at first, but the benefits of the commercially successful ones will far outweight the unsuccessful ones.

Before undertaking to construct or assist in the construction of access roads to mining areas, the merits of any application on behalf of venture capital are carefully studied by our technical experts before committing the government to the

expenditure of any monies under the mining roads estimates.

Any hon. member who has flown over Northern Ontario could not help being impressed with the magnitude of the territory -- the vast green carpet spread below extending for hundreds of miles, broken only by a myriad of lakes and rivers. He must have been impressed by the fact that this great forest land is almost literally a "trackless wilderness", virtually unmarked by roads for scores of square miles.

All who have sat in this House during other sessions to listen to addresses by hon. members representing Northern Ontario ridings must have been struck by one recurring theme -- the need for roads to open up our great northland and to develop its immense resources.

The brief history of Northern Ontario, spanning little more than half a century, certainly supports the claim that settlement and development follow close on the heels of communication. Towns, farms, timber operations and mining production are found most thickly in the strips along the railway rights-of-way and highway. The wisdowm shown by hon. members of this House in past years in constructing

as a public investment, the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway (now the Ontario Northland Railway) and the Ferguson Highway (now a major part of the great coast-to-coast route which is nearing competion) has been more than justified. Without them, this province could never have its great pulp and paper industry, its mines turning out hundreds of millions of dollars worth of precious metal every year, or much of its multi-million dollar tourist business.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness and with full respect for the accomplishments of the older, more settled parts of this province, I say that Ontario's real wealth and its future greatness lies, not so much in Toronto, nor in any other city in the south but in the vast and thinly populated area of the Northland.

Rich as have been the dividends on the investment there so far, the North's potentialities have scarcely been scratched. Nor will they be more than scratched until we have the population to develop our resources as they should be developed. Give us roads, give us the opportunity to grow and the population will follow as surely as day follows night. The North is capable of providing an adequate and fruitful life to millions. This province wants immigrants of the right sort. Let us give them

the facilities to make life more enjoyable, less isolated, and they will gladly flock to populate our vacant miles.

I am proud, and I think the officials of my department may be proud of the way we have used the money which you have allotted to us for the construction of mine access roads.

We do not try to build super highways such as we have in the south. Much less costly, but adequate for the job they do are the gravel-surfaced roads, whose length might be anything from one to thirty miles, which open up mining lands to development. Nor, in most cases, does the government -- that is, the people of Ontario -- defray the entire cost. Invariably, unless there be exceptional circumstances, if a single mine or group of mines will derive specific benefit from any road, the mine or mines will be called upon to share in the cost of construction.

The advantages of this system are obvious. First, of course, it reduces our capital expenditure by half or even more. Then, because every yard of road laid will cost the company money, we have a double check against unnecessary frills.

I think it is fitting that I should acknowledge the co-operation which has been extended

to the Mines Department by the Department of Highways in these projects. The Highways engineers are the specialists we call on to assist in planning and to approve construction specifications and to verify that the work has been done satisfactorily. Without their help, our own road-building program would necessarily be a much more cumbersome, more expensive business than it is.

Our departmental road building program is elastic and, within the limitations set by the budget, there are few hard and fast rules, except of course that as mining access roads, the roads must be located in such a way that they open the way to established mine property or to areas which give geological promise. Apart from that, each case is decided on its own merits.

Most, if not all, sectors of Northern Ontario have already benefitted by roads which have reached completion and more are now being constructed or are under consideration for action this year.

I have here a summary of the work which has been accomplished to date and of that which is contemplated. I feel satisfied that the hon. members of this House will agree that it constitutes

an extremely worthwhile record of achievement for a limited outlay.

I suggest that hon. members refer to the maps which have been placed on their desks and in that way, perhaps, they may gain a more comprehensive idea of just what has been accomplished, what is being done, and what we hope may be done in the way of road building in the not too distant future. The heavy black lines indicate mine roads on which the work has been completed or is underway; heavy broken lines mark roads now under consideration.

In the far western part of the province, in the Red Lake area you will see a short strip of road connecting the McKenzie Red Lake Mine with the settlement of Cottage Cove, about a mile and one-half distant. The work here consisted of improvements to the existing trail, and the cost was divided equally between the mine company and the Department. Our share was $1,994.

The Red Lake district profited by the construction of another short road which was completed last year. This was a mile-and-a-quarter stretch connecting Rowan Consolidated Mines in Todd Township with Tolden Arm Landing on Red Lake. In this case, much of the early work had been done

independently by the company prior to the adoption by this House of the measure to assist in the construction of such mining roads. It was, however, deemed only fair, because of the importance of the area, that we should make the assistance retroactive. As a result, the Department agreed to meet all costs up to $7,000 and half of all in excess of that amount. Thus, the total cost to the Department was $9,225.

An arrangement with the Department of Highways made possible a number of changes and improvements to the road from the town of Red Lake to the Starratt-Olsen Mine and the Madsen-Red Lake properties. The road, which is about 7½ miles in length, was originally constructed under a Dominion-Provincial agreement in 1937. The Mines Department is to share in the cost to the extent of $16,000.

In the Kenora District is the Newlund Mines road, a two-mile stretch, connecting the mine near Sious Lookout with the highway between Sioux Lookout and Dryden. The Mines Department undertook to finance some urgently needed improvements to this road, at an estimated cost of $3,000. The actual work was done by the Highways Department.

Moving eastward to the Sault Ste. Marie area, the Department took action to facilitiate

a mining development program of Transcontinental Resources Limited, by agreeing to complete a 2½ mile road link, between Highway No. 17 at Garden River and the Jardun Mine. The total cost to the government for this project was $13,861. The company had previously expended $12,500 on the road.

The Algoma District stands to gain from another road to which improvements were completed last year. This road, 12½ miles in length connects the Renabie Mine with Missanabie and in addition to its service as a mining access road, it is used in timber operations. It was originally built in 1941 jointly, by the Dominion and Provincial governments and the mining company. The rehabilitation program cost the Department of Mines a total of $28,193.

In the Gogama-Sudbury area, a road seven miles long connects Foleyet with Ivanhoe Lake. Improvements to the road and the construction of a bridge cost the Department $4,461. This road not only gives access to promising mining territory but it also serves as a form of insurance for another of our great natural resources, in that it opens up a great timber area to fire-fighting equipment. It is, of course, used extensively in normal timber operations.

In the Chapleau area, the Department of Mines expended the sum of $28,000 on a 12-mile road to give access to the Nemegos Uranium Mines from the Chapleau Highway and an extension to Nemegos Station. The road also provides access to the potentially valuable deposits of magnetite in McNaught Township.

A very important project completed last year was the Jonsmith Road, a vitally needed six-mile stretch near Capreol. It serves the rich area, surrounding the Milnet Mine and makes it possible for this important producer to ship their ore directly to the smelter at Falconbridge. Because of the heavy traffic it will be called upon to bear, the road was built to a higher standard than some others and the cost was correspondingly higher. However, indications already are that the $199,517 expenditure will pay big dividends in increased production. I might say in connection with this road, they commenced hauling 300 tons per day over that road to the smelter.

A bridge over the Mattawa River, on a road leading to the North Bay Mica Mine (formerly known as the Purdy Mine) was built in 1951 at a cost to the Department of $5,950. The road on which the bridge is located connects the mine with

Highway 17. During 1942-43 the Federal Government and the Ontario Department of Highways co-operated in making improvements to the road.

The Broulan Reef Gold Mines and other active producers in the Timmins area are served by a 4½ mile road to a gravel pit in Murphy Township. The road is being used not only by the mining interests concerned but by the general public and the municipalities of Tisdale and Whitney. Cost to the Department on a 50 percent. basis was $25,736.

Another road which has been completed, directly affects the Johns-Manville Company. This is the Holtyre road in the area of Matheson. Designed to afford transportation between the village of Holtyre and the mine site, the road was constructed under the direction of the Department of Highways. It is anticipated that when the books are finally closed the total cost will be $60,000 with the Mines Department contributing $23,000.

In the Matachewan area, a road was built on a co-operative basis with the Department and the Matarrow Lead Mines sharing the cost. The road, about three and one-half miles in length, connects the mine with the Matachewan Consolidated mill. The Department's share of the cost was $22,858.

In 1951, a road extending from Obabika Lake to the property of the New Delhi Mining Company in Delhi township was completed at a cost of $10,000 of which the Department's share was one-half.

The roads I have mentioned so far have all been completed and the Department's books are closed insofar as their construction cost is concerned. A number more are still under construction.

Returning to the western end of the province, in the Fort Francis area, there is a road connecting the Coldstream Copper Mines with Kashabowie Station, eight miles distant. A commitment to assist in improvements to this road at an estimated cost of $30,000 was made by the Department. Some work has been done by the company but the original project has not been completed and awaits further consideration.

Another road for which approval has been given is in the District of Kenora. There, Noranda Mines Limited has been authorized to proceed with improvements to a road linking the company's property to Atikwa Lake and Caviar Lake to permit development of a promising deposit of gold and copper. The Department agreed to pay 50 percent of the cost up to $4,000. The total cost to date is $2,250 of which the Department is to pay half.

The South Onaman River road, east of Lake Nipigon, a very important access road is due to be completed early this year. The road is about 14½ miles in length and opens up a very promising mineralized belt. It connects with a private lumbering road owned by the Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company. In addition to opening up new territory for easier exploration and for development of surface resources it will be of direct benefit to two existing mines, Headway Red Lake and Coulee Lead and Zinc Mines. The estimated total cost is $265,000.

Three important construction projects are under way in the Sudbury district. One of these, the Gogama-Westree road will total about 35 miles. It connects Gogama to the southern extremity of the Elk Lake Road and in addition to opening up the eastern end of a geologically favourable belt, it will be of great assistance to the Department of Lands and Forests in combatting outbreaks of fire. Also, of course, it will serve as an important thoroughfare for the use of district residents, tourists and lumber companies. The estimated total cost of the road is $225,000.

New, expanded operations of the Ontario Pyrites Company in the Sudbury area will be made possible with the completion of a road running from

the mine shaft, on the south side of Vermillion Lake to a junction with the Fairbanks township road at the north boundary of the township. The road is being built by the mining company at an estimated cost of $80,000 of which the Department will pay half. The work is proceeding.

In the Sudbury Basin, a road is being constructed to link the East Rim Nickel Mines with the smelter at Falconbridge. The cost to the Department to date, assessed on a 50 percent basis is $12,450. A further commitment of $10,000 has been made to cover the construction of an overhead bridge to cross the C.N.R. tracks. The completed road will be about six miles long.

Construction was started on January 1st this year on another major project in the Timmins area. The Warren Lake road, when completed, will serve as an extension of the road connecting Timmins with Warren Lake in Keefer township through the townships of Hillary, Sewell and Reeves to where it connects with the Kukatush road -- a privately operated lumber road. It follows a very promising belt of mineralized rock in which several properties are under exploration at the present time. Altogether the road will give ready access to an important mining area in which the Johns-Manville

Company is exploring a promising deposit of asbestos. It is hoped that eventually this 20-mile road may be extended to serve the Horwood Lake-Swayze-Cunningham area and possibly that it may be made to connect up with Chapleau. The estimated cost of the portion now under contract is $250,000.

The Department of Mines have made investigations into a number of other proposals for mining access roads, and, having been convinced that positive action is called for have approved the construction in a number of cases. In some cases, this approval has already been given; in others it is still pending, with the result that a program of new construction and road improvement is on the books for the coming fiscal year.

In Farr township in the District of Temiskaming a road is being built to connect the Roy Silver Mines with Highway 65. Here, too, the work is being done by the Highways Department with the Mines Department paying all the costs up to a maximum of $3,000.

The resurgent Cobalt camp which has made a spectacular comeback during the last few years will profit by the construction of a new three-mile-long road to Silver Centre from the Gilgreer Mines in

South Lorrain Township. To date, the mining company has spent $29,555 and it is estimated that a further expenditure of $5,000 will be required to complete the job. The Department is committed to bear half the total cost.

Access to a recently discovered deposit of mica in McConkey township, south of Lake Nipissing, will be made possible by the construction of the Caribou Lake Mica Mines road. The Inspiration Mining and Development Company has been authorized to proceed with the construction of the five-mile road to Loring village at an estimated cost of about $10,000, of which the Department will pay half. The road was required to permit the company to ship crude mica to the trimming plant at North Bay for processing. However, the road has not yet been completed and remains for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been worthwhile to outline to this House the work we are trying to do in opening up the great mining areas of the North. The budget is limited and the work must be spread over a vast area to the best possible advantage. I have every confidence that, as the hon. members scanned the map of Northern Ontario, and on it spotted the roads which we have already

managed to build, and the others which we contemplate, they will agree that much has already been done and that much more must be done this year and in the years to come, just as speedily as funds become available.

(TAKE D FOLLOWS)

MR. GEORGE T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to rise and address this Assembly and bring to the attention of its hon. members some matters of great importance -- important not only to the people in my own constituency of Brantford, but to the people of adjacent ridings as well.

From time to time, especially during spring floods, you have read in the daily papers stories of the Grand River - "the noble Grand River" - overflowing its banks and causing considerable damage and great inconvenience to many thousands of people.

There are many municipalities located on the Grand River, or its tributaries. Among them are Fergus, Elmira, Waterloo, Kitchener, Preston, Hespeler, Galt, Guelph, Paris, Dunnville and my own city of Brantford. I am sure we will all agree that each of these towns and cities is a thriving community, possessing many and varied industries employing many thousands of workers.

But, I am sorry to say, Mr.Speaker, each and every one of these communities is guilty of a most grievous and dangerous practice, that of polluting the waters of the once beautiful Grand River.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, each and every day of the year, approximately 34 million gallons of municipal wastes are dumped by these communities I have mentioned into the Grand River.

When the members of this House visualize the

magnitude of this practice, I feel certain that you will be more than interested in several facts I have prepared concerning this matter.

There are at present, according to the latest census figures, some 273,000 people in these various communities that are located along this river. Many thousands are newly married couples raising young families in what might be termed close proximity to an open sewer, which, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the Grand River has become. Fortunately, only two of these communities, Brantford and Dunnville, use the waters of the Grand for drinking purposes, and Cayuga contemplated using the River for its water supply.

The hon. members here will recall, I am sure, the days of their youth when the wonders of spring descended upon our land and every youngster had that irresistable urge to make for the swimmin' hole, all intent on being the first one in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I only hope the parents of young children living near the Grand River today have the foresight to warn them to stay away from the swimming holes there, because the river now is a place where they could swallow dangerous bacteria, or become as "one wearing a coat of many colours" from the industrial dyes that are dumped into it, or again they might be covered with a matted growth of hair from the wool wastes that flow into it.

Some of these communities such as Fergus, Elmira, Waterloo, Galt, give primary treatment to the effluent dumped, while others such as Preston, Hespeler, and Guelph give secondary or complete treatment to their sewage. Kitchener gives part treatment. But even though primary and secondary treatment is given to 80 per cent of the sewage is still being dumped into the river every 24 hours.

Here is a fairly brief report from the Grand River Anti-Pollution Committee which I would like to read to the hon. members:

> "In June 1951, the Brant Rod and Gun Club inaugurated a program aimed at the elimination or abatement of pollution in the Grand River. Other clubs from Wellington County, Waterloo county, Waterloo, Kitchener, Preston, Paris, Caledonia, Hagersville, Dunnville, and Cayuga, were invited to participate, and by their doing so, a group of sportsmen clubs along the Grand River known as the Grand River Anti Pollution Committee was formed.
>
> "It is the aim of this Committee to combat pollution of the Grand river. This pollution being caused by untreated human waste from various sewage systems, and from improperly treated and untreated industrial wastes from many industries, and from many other causes, including soil erosion.
>
> "The most offensive and most visible type of pollution is that of untreated human sewage. It is positively sickening to observe a group of children swimming amid solid pieces of human waste; semi-dissolved paper, etc., floating on top of the water. Despite the fact that we boast of a high level of civilization this condition exists all along the Grand river and the banning of swimming by health officers is not the answer.
>
> "Waterloo has a primary treatment plant that is completely inadequate to cope with the amount of waste it has to handle as

a view of its outlet will verify. Kitchener also gives primary treatment to some of its sewage, nut an overflow at the rate of 70 to 80 million gallons of raw sewage shows the inability of that plant to handle the volume of sewage that passes through it.

"Patrons of a drive-in theatre near this treatment plant were forced to keep their car windows closed because of the odour. Residents nearly could not open their house windows because of the odour.

"A few years ago several cattle belonging to a Mr. Martin died after grazing on grass that had been covered by a residue left after high river water had receded downstream from this plant. A court case ensued. A resident of the Six Nations below Brantford drives his cattle one and a half miles to the Boston creek for water rather than allow them to drink from the Grand river.

"Textile industries along the river add to this pollution by dumping dye vats, etc. into the river coloring it every colour of the rainbow for miles down stream.

"A chemical discharge from a plastic processing plant in the Waterloo area has resulted in fish that were caught at Port Maitland and shipped to New York markets being rejected and destroyed because of the strong taste of phenol in them. Commercial fishermen at the river mouth strongly protest the vast amount of pollution coming from the river into Lake Erie.

"Pollution of the Grand exists throughout its length to a varying degree but becomes progressively greater as it passes through each town or city. All towns , cities or municipalities are offenders but as our research goes on it becomes increasingly evident that Brantford city is the greatest offender. That a city of this size be allowed in a civilized country to use a river for a sewer is nothing short of a national disgrace, and an infringement of human rights.

"Dr. M. Phillips, Ontario Minister of Health, and Dr. A. E. Berry, Department of Sanitary Engineers, have both expressed deep concern over the polluted conditions of the Grand river from a health viewpoint and have promised this committee co-operation of their respective departments. Dr. L. Hutton, M.O.H. Brant County and the Brant county Health unit have presented a resolution to the Provincial Government asking that action be started to clean up the river. Brant County Council and various townships councils have also endorsed similar resolutions.

"As a result of pollution the Brant County Health Unit have prohibited farmers using river water on vegetables and fruits eaten raw, i.e. strawberries, lettuce, etc. This is detrimental to good farming practices of many farmers.

"Township councils have expressed resentment that cities are allowed to use the river as a sewer.

"They assure us that much land that could be used for residential and farming purposes and in the case of the lower end of the river, for recreational purposes have been rendered valueless because of pollution.

"Various surveys have been made to assess the severity of the pollution, by various government and municipal groups and all have been of the opinion that pollution must be stopped.

"Dr. A. E. Berry in 1949 in a report published in 'Sewage and Water,' stressed the need of sewage treatment along the Grand. At many meetings of various groups the same theme has been stressed. At a meeting of Kiwanas in Brantford, February 1952, he stated:

> "'The question of river pollution is one of vital concern to all municipalities of the Grand river really, - if we are going to solve the problem of pollution we must give priority to sewage treatment even though the cost is high. It is not a matter of what we should have done in the past but of what we are going to do in the future.'

"Dr. M. Phillips stressed the same thoughts in an address over CKPC Brantford last July.

> "River conditions are rapidly growing worse each year. According to our information the legal aspects of enforcing the existing laws concerning pollution is vested in the Provincial Government. As representatives of various sportsmen clubs we of this committee represent some 4,500 residents of the Grand river valley and we expect to see some action being taken by the government in the near future."

This report was handed to me by the Grand River Anti-pollution Committee.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members have not been wearied by these details. I have a number of others, but I believe I have revealed enough to convince everyone that this is a vital matter to the nearly three hundred thousand people who live along the banks of the Grand River. I feel that it is about time something was done to remedy this situation. I want to impress upon the hon. Minister of Health, who has had his attention directed to these conditions, not only through his own department, but on numerous occasions in this House and by correspondence from the Brant County Board of Health, that as long as they continue to exist, the health of not only all the people in these municipalities is endangered, but also that of thousands upon thousands of other people who pass through the district, particularly in the summer months when danger of contagion and infection is greatest.

I submit it is time Section 105 of the Public Health Act was enforced in dealing with the pollution of these waters, and that a comprehensive survey

be made and an all-embracing plan be devised to correct conditions that are growing worse every year, to the lasting disgrace of this province. Let us have some action under the existing legislation before these municipalities are stricken with disease that might become of plague proportions.

Since becoming a member for Brantford riding, I have many times been appealed to by gardeners and farmers on the Grand River near Brantford who have been refused the use of the waters of the river (which they are legally entitled to) for the irrigation of their crops. One large farm had to put in its own system and make ponds costing many thousands of dollars. This was an irrigation system which was taken from the Grand River, but it had to be scrapped, as I told you, because the Board had refused the farmers the use of the Grand River to irrigate their crops. This expense cannot be borne by the small gardener.

Under sub-section 4 of section 102 of the Public Health Act, these farmers could bring action against the people responsible for the pollution of these waters, but the question is who would they bring action against because so many industries and municipalities are to blame for polluting the river.

The Act is clear on the subject of pollution, and I submit again, Mr. Speaker, it should be enforced even if it means financial assistance by the

province. The complete erection of sewage disposal plants cost millions of dollars and the municipalities concerned in many cases are not in a position to spend all that money. Consider the City of Brantford, for instance. Regarding the high school and the hospitals; if the hospital bills are passed which are now before the people, it will cost another $2,800,000, and I think that the province should give some thought and action towards correcting the conditions that I have spoken of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on to another matter which also concerns the Department of Health. As you know, Brantford was and is the only city in Canada and in the Commonwealth to fluorinate its waters. I have spoken of this before. You may recall that it was early in 1945 that the City of Brantford Public Utilities Commission gave the go-ahead signal to fluoridate the water in that city, and it was not many weeks after that we began to get some complaints of the many terrible things that were happening because of the fluoridation of the water. Dysentery was prevalent; in fact, one manager of a firm said he had dysentery caused by the fluoridation of the water. False teeth were being stained and peculiar rims were appearing around bathtubs, and we let this go on until May of that year, when we told the people that the fluoridation had not yet started because the machinery had not arrived to put the fluorine in the water.

Then we did not get any more complaints. That is what is happening now. We are getting all kinds of stories about fluoridation which are just not so.

Before the fluorine experiment started in June of 1945, and at the seventh annual meeting - not the fifth as was quoted by the Globe and Mail recently, but it is seven and a half years to be exact, - and at the seventh annual meeting of the Fluorine Committee, Dr. A. E. Berry, Director of the Ontario Health Department division of sanitary engineering, said that a great deal was being written and spoken on fluoridation by persons having no information on the subject.

In a news item on February 13th last, the hon. Minister of Planning and Development, in speaking about fluoridation, said about 90 per cent of the cost of fluoridating water would go down the drain because of the small proportion of city water supply which is used actually for cleaning teeth.

I beg to inform the hon. minister that while the water is used for cleaning teeth it would not have the effect in preventing tooth decay. The benefit only comes from drinking the water.

He also stated that it has not been established definitely that fluorine in the water is good for the human system and that some maintain that it is harmful.

There is absolutely no proof that Brantford

water has been harmful to any of its citizens. Here is the result of seven years' experiment in Brantford with fluoridation:

There has been a reduction of 41 per cent in tooth decay.

19.4 per cent of Brantford children have perfect teeth compared to 5.18 per cent in 1944.

There are 9,958 more perfect teeth in the children which would not have been there if the decay rate of 1944 had continued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the children in Brant County who do not have the benefit of Brantford city water, can receive a dental health service which would do something to halt the appalling amount of tooth decay.

Public Health grants paid by the Government of Canada are available to local health units when approved by the provincial Department of Health. The local Board of Health, accordingly, applied for a grant to pay for a dental Public Health program to take care of the children in the towns, villages and rural areas of Brant County. The Board acted on the advice of dental public health authorities who advised that the employment of dental hygienists in Health units is the answer to the problem of how best to increase public awareness of the importance of dental health.

As everyone knows, there is a great scarcity of dentists and there is little hope for the development

of a public dental health program which will meet the needs of the people unless a new approach to the problem can be found. That new approach seems to have been made in several Canadian provinces, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but not in Ontario.

A dental hygienist should be as capable as a dentist in informing the public how dental health can be maintained. She should be as effective as a dentist in persuading parents to seek early dental care of their children.

On February 15th, 1952, the Brant County Board of Health met in Brantford with the Ontario Dental Public Health Committee. I was present at the meeting. The question of applying a chemical solution to the teeth of selected rural children for the purpose of preventing dental decay was discussed. The members of the Committee were unanimous in their opinion that it would be a great saving of a dentist's time to have this topical application done by a dental hygienist. They pointed out, however, that this work would have to be done in a dentist's office.

(Take E Follows)

The Board is now informed that under the Dentistry Act, a dental hygienist working in a dentist's office may be trusted with the simple procedure of applying a chemical solution to the teeth of children. But a dental hygienist working in a Health Unit is prohibited by the Dentistry Act from going into rural schools and applying the same solution, even though she works under the direction of a dentist.

Moreover, the Board of Health has now been informed by the Provincial Department of Health as follows:

> "The limitations placed upon the activities of a dental hygienist by the Dentistry Act and regulations appears to us to make it impossible for such personnel to use their training in a qualified capacity in a preventive dental program."

Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious that the Dentistry Act is having an effect which was never intended when passed by the Provincial Legislature. It may well be that the key to the future of better dental health may be the training of large numbers of dental hygienists and their employment in local health departments. The Act as it now stands is holding back public health in the province. The topical application of fluoride to children's teeth would result in a forty per

cent reduction in tooth decay.

I submit that the Dentistry Act should be amended to correct what appears to be an unreasonable prohibition. If a dental hygienist is allowed to perform this duty in a dental office, under a dentist's supervision, I see no reason why objection should be taken to it being performed under similar supervision in a rural school. In other words, take down the fence which the dentist profession has built around it.

I would refer you to the Ontario Health Survey, which recognized what I have been speaking about. At page 181, it says:

> "Time now given to training dental nurses in dental technology could be used to better advantage for courses of training in preventive and control procedures, which would enable them to give health instructions and counselling as it relates to dental health."

Then, in Chapter 6:

> "Dental hygienist training should be inaugurated in order to meet the need of ancillary personnel in large units and municipal departments of health. It is estimated that a minimum of ten hygienists each year could be employed to advantage in organized dental health programs within the province."

I would suggest that that amendment be made to

the Act, and Brantford would like to have at least two of these hygienists in their dental health program.

I also wish to direct a few remarks to the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). I am sure we all have a great regard for him, and I want to commend him for making the benefits of The Totally Disabled Persons' Allowance Act available, but I also want to complain about a fine distinction that is drawn by the Department of Public Welfare in the administration of the Act -- a distinction, I believe, that works a hardship on some deserving people. I shall deal with only one specific case, and I have had many, as no doubt many hon. members have had, that of a woman in Brantford, which has been brought to my attention.

This woman has had more than her share of misfortune. Illness has plagued her for more than fifty years. She has osteomyelitis, total deafness, gall bladder trouble, kidney trouble, gastric ulcers and spinal arthritis, also high blood pressure. She has undergone twelve major operations, and has suffered numerous bone fractures. Her is, indeed, a pathetic case. She is permanently disabled. After her case was reported and reviewed by the Board her doctor wrote this:

> "At the time of completing the original application it was impossible to include all this information, as I would have had to cancel all my work for one day to do so, because of the fact that applicant is totally deaf and over two hours was spent at that time.
>
> "This woman is definitely totally and permanently disabled and if refused aid by your branch will have to depend solely on local welfare aid."

Her case has been before the Department of Welfare, but the application for an allowance for her has been turned down because the Advisory Board, in their opinion, would not certify her totally disabled in the sense that she is unable to perform the ordinary activities of daily living without the assistance of another person. It admitted she was permanently disabled.

If the Act is intended to be so restrictive and possess such limitations, it seems to me it defeats to a great extent the purpose for which it was intended, and many deserving cases such as this will go unaided. When this legislation was introduced, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province looked upon it as a progressive step. It was progressive in the liberal sense, but I submit that in its application and practice it is narrow and, to say the least, most conservative.

I hope cases like this will be reviewed and others of a similar nature, so that these really deserving people may reap the benefits which the people of this province believe the present administration has made available to the disabled. I cannot agree that there should be one type of permanently disabled persons who are the municipalities' responsibility and another type for provincial responsibility.

I am in favour of any plan which would reduce educational costs to the municipalities, through a saving in supplying architects' plans. The architects' plans cost anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000. This is a costly item in any school building plans. I believe these plans should be supplied to school boards through the Department of Education, which must have several plans on hand from which to choose. The experience of the Department of Education in planning and building schools could be drawn on, and the Public Works Department architects could be of assistance in this respect. Substantial savings could be effected and some of the burden on municipal taxation lifted.

I also feel that when the Government calls for tenders for public buildings, it should

state the union rates of pay prevailing in the city or town where the building is to be erected, and see that these rates are met in the contract. I mention this because in the building of an addition to the Brantford School for the Blind, non-union bricklayers were brought in at 25 cents per hour less than the rate paid in Brantford. The Brantford Trades and Labour Council were concerned about this, and wrote the Department of Labour and the Department of Public Works, but did not get any satisfaction.

The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Myers) in his speech the other day spoke of the financial difficulties of his local transportation system. In Brantford, our transportation system is operating at a loss. In 1952, the deficit was $10,856, and $27,140 was paid by it in gasoline tax for buses driven over our city streets. Eventually this deficit will have to be paid by the already overburdened taxpayer. I believe some relief in gas tax should be provided to help our publicly-owned transportation systems.

When the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) was speaking the other day about husbands deserting wives, I do not believe that hon. members of this House realized how serious

this is. I have a particular case where a husband deserted his wife and three children,to live with another woman. She brought action against him for support. The case was dismissed, and the reason given was that her father was looking after her.

I received this from the Crown Attorney's Department:

> "The charge was dismissed by the magistrate on the grounds that she was not in destitute or necessitous circumstances after her father, Mr. Taylor, had given evidence to the effect that he was supporting her and was able to do so, following the decision of Rex vs. McDonald (1942) O.W.N. 658, which is quoted on page 268 of the fifth edition of Tremeear's Criminal Code."

Mr. Speaker, this woman did not realize at that time how serious this was and how it was going to affect her in the future. The husband went scot free and she was left to carry the burden. This man was killed while working for the Ontario Hydro Commission. She applied for compensation, which she honestly believed she was entitled to. This has been refused her, the Board only accepting responsibility for the three children. Here is the point I want to make: if an order for support had been granted by the Court when she brought action, even if her husband had ignored it and not

paid a cent, she would now be entitled to a pension for life. Because the c se was dismissed at the time she cannot receive a pension, and when these children become of age she will not have any income whatsoever. I feel this woman was wrongly advised at the time, as I understand under the provincial Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, and not under the Criminal Code, sh' would have been granted an order for support. The Compensation Board refuse responsibility because of this technicality, and thereby this woman, as the wife of this man, is not receiving the pension to which she is entitled.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this widow is entitled to a pension even though the Board is refusing it on that technicality, and I think on compassionate grounds alone she should be granted a pension.

MR. JOHN YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Session we paused in memory of men who had taken part in the deliberations of this Assembly, and who had given leadership to the people of this Province. This community suffered at the beginning of the year, and I wish to bring it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a loss in the death of the late E. F. Singer. Mr. Singer was a great leader within the Jewish community, and the Mount Sinai Hospital, passed by many hon. members of this House daily, was one of his early dreams. Mr. Singer lived in and represented St. Andrews riding in the years 1929 to 1934, and he represented it well. He will long be remembered for his efforts in bringing about the anti-discrimination legislation within this House. It was he who took the initial steps with regard to a certain Bill to prevent insurance companies from denying coverage to certain races and certain creeds. That was an initial step in a long line of anti-discrimination legislation, which subsequent Conservative Governments, including this one, brought about.

I first got to know Mr. Singer some two years ago, and I had hoped to become one of his friends. Unfortunately, his illness denied me that privilege. Mr. Speaker, as in the case of many, his life, and his

service to the public has made this community a better place in which to live.

Returning to the living, the present hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in his speech on the Throne Debate took it upon himself, as he often does, to give this House his opinion on many things. He made reference to the Cabinet and the Government with words such as "lack of lustre," and "uneasiness." Those words rolled easily from his lips. Prior to November, 1951, I was proud to have been associated with this same Government; I was proud that the people of Bellwoods riding gave me the opportunity of being even more closely associated, and, now, three Sessions and many pieces of fine legislation later, that pride -- great as it was in the beginning -- is even greater. I am sure that the people of this Province, regardless of how they cast their ballots, congratulate themselves today upon the Administration they now have.

Mr. Speaker, those words, and words very similar, could not aptly be applied to the hon. member for St. Andrew himself. I can assure you that the people of this Province, and the people of all sections, are rapidly becoming aware of the fact that no Communist can or does represent their interests in particular, or the people of this

Province in general. If the hon.member for St. Andrew, who referred to the streets of his riding so well, would take time out and walk down those streets he would find he would have a great verification of that realization.

Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned about the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) reaching over and pointing a finger, and saying: "I would rather stand up here and tell the truth and be defeated." The people of Bellwoods riding, who were subjected for some eight years to that kind of talk, made their decision, and I am confident that in the next election they will tell the hon. member for St. Andrew how much validity there is in what he has to say in the deliberations of this House.

The hon. member for St. Andrew has gone to great lengths and taken up a great deal of time to disassociate himself from the hon. members of this House. However, it appears that on certain occasions he wants to convince others that certain hon. members in this House associate themselves, or would like to associate themselves, with him. At the Toronto and Yorks convention of the Communist party, after the last Session of this House, the Canadian Tribune reported as follows:

> "One young Tory M.P.P., following a speech of mine, drew me aside and told me, 'Some day when I get enough courage I am going to speak up and openly back you and there are ten more like me,' Salsberg told the Convention."

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how far the rules of this House will permit me to go, but I would say to you that I have great difficulty in believing that such a statement was ever made. It is not courage that is necessary to back the hon. member, and if and when the chips are ever down between the way of life the Communist party represents and the Canadian way of life, the hon. member for St. Andrew will find out just how much courage there is in this House and outside as well.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not courage which is needed; it is a devotion to the Communist party line, and we have seen that the hon. member for St.Andrew has an over-abundance of it. I should imagine that at the next convention of the Toronto and Yorks Communist party, the hon. member will say, as he is reported in The Canadian Tribune, to have said, "Salsberg gave example after example of how he had utilized the theme of the new program as each issue came before the Legislature."

Mr. Speaker, I am differing on what the "new program" is as seen through the eyes of the hon.

member for St. Andrew and through my own eyes, but I do say this, that the keynote of that theme is vilification of the United States of America, and the hon. member, no matter how much he may try to persuade people that other Canadians associate themselves with his ideas, knows/the people of this country are wise enough to distinguish between men who in public life rise and speak sincerely, and those who have an ulterior motive, a motive of splitting friendship between this country and the United States of America.

I hold no brief for the United States of America, except as a Canadian citizen living next door to them. The hon. member for St. Andrew has indicated that he has not much use for the people of the United States of America; he has indicated that he has not much use for the --

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I ask for your permission. I have no desire to rob the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) of any publicity that he is sure to get by making an anti-communist speech. Let him go ahead and get all the publicity he wants; it may be the only way he can get publicity. I have never here nor anywhere said anything derogatory about the people of the United States. I am very critical of the policies of the present Government, that is all.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: Oh, sit down.

(F-1 follows)

MR. SALSBERG: I will sit down when I am good and ready, and not when the hon. Minister asks me to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. SALSBERG: We have a Speaker in the House, and --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. YAREMKO: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Andrew is very skilful in masking his words. The Canadian Tribune, which talks for his peoples' party, is not so subtle. When it comes to the Canadian way of life, this House has heard the opinion of the hon. member for St. Andrew, that socialism would make of this country a "Garden of Eden." I presume -- and on this point the hon. member may correct me if he wishes -- that he believes socialism has made a Garden of Eden of the USSR. Mr. Speaker, Federal Judge James Gimmick, of the New York Court, gave thirteen convicted Communists the right to go to that "Garden of Eden" and they refused.

Mr. Speaker, there are in this land and in this Province not one or two thousand, but tens of thousands of people, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Poles, Ukrainians, Czechoslovakians, and others who will tell the hon. member what

that "Garden of Eden" holds for people who wish to have the liberties which he enjoys in this country. There are millions within that "Garden of Eden" at the present time who would gladly exchange their places there for that which the hon. member for St. Andrew has the privilege to enjoy.

I seek no publicity, Mr. Speaker, as was referred to by the hon. member, and I regret that certain other hon. members and myself have to take the time of the House to bring this to the attention of hon. members, but, so long as the Communist party spreads its propaganda outside the House and so long as the hon. member who belongs to that Communist party has his remarks read into the record of this Assembly, which often goes throughout the whole Commonwealth of Nations, I believe it is only proper that we hon. members record our remarks in order to show that there is one hon. member who feels as he does.

With respect to the problems which face this House and the country. There has been, as shown by the expressions of hon. members of this House, a good deal of concern about highway traffic safety, and properly so, because one can scarcely be otherwise than appalled by the toll of lives and physical and property damage which

has been done. At the end of the year statistics are prepared showing the loss of life, limb and property. But these are statistics, Mr. Speaker, only of visible items; there is no way of measuring the impact that an accident has on the lives of those concerned, regardless of whether they are fortunate enough to be indemnified, and the impact on the lives of those, who, being at fault, have to carry the burden themselves. The problem is one of gigantic proportions, as shown by the analysis given this House by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) when he informed hon. members there was a sufficient number of vehicles in this Province to put every man, woman and child on wheels.

One would think on a hot summer day that the people of the Province of Ontario were out to prove his point.

The hon. Minister of Highways and his Department have gone a long way in reducing accidents and in minimizing the possibility of accidents. This is a recognized fact. The construction and design of our modern highways are based on the premise of safety, as is obvious to all who travel those highways. This same premise of safety is being worked into the old highways, and the hon. Minister is to be congratulated on the work being done to eliminate

blind spots and curves.

Beyond the program of highway safety, traffic education has been great, for, truly, no engineer can design an accident-free highway, and it is well that in this busy modern world we are reminded from time to time of the basic and simple rules for traffic safety. Most of the drivers of this Province are very grateful, Mr. Speaker, to see the safety signs and the safety lines along the highways. As to the careless driver, the Departments concerned have, in their enforcement of traffic laws and in the suspension program, penalized those who have abused or who have shown that they not entitled to what has rightly been called a privilege. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee to the car driver who "ventures" forth -- and I use that word advisedly -- that he will return safely. The penalizing program and the suspension program have reduced the number of those who can do him harm, but that is only to a degree.

It is true we cannot legislate safety, but measures can still be taken to further minimize the possibility of accidents, and continued scientific construction, continued traffic education, and other suggestions made by hon. members of this

House are along those lines.

I suggest to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that he consider taking under advisement a program of examination of drivers for physical fitness, and the periodic inspection of vehicles.

A situation that might exist was reported in the Toronto Daily Star on January 23rd, when Toronto's Police Commission had a cab driver before it for disciplining, who could not hear the conversation taking place. It is obvious that full safety cannot exist where drivers whose eyesight, hearing or other faculities are such as to render them unfit to control a vehicle capable of high speeds, can obtain a licence.

I do not refer, Mr. Speaker, to those who are phsyically handicapped, but who, by reason of special training or special circumstances, are able to carry on, driving not only as well as the driver who is not handicapped but, as I have known from personal experience, even better.

It is true that on applications for renewals there are questions to be answered in respect of physical ability, but one can see how often many people may innocently answer no, or if they

wrongfully answer "No", may not be discovered until too late -- the accident will have taken place.

I also understand that the Department requires a re-examination where a person has indicated he is prone to accidents, but again the accident or accidents has or have taken place.

What is required is some sort of certificate of physical fitness to be presented on every third or fifth, or even tenth renewal. In this way some measure of direct control could be maintained.

The same necessity of control applies to all vehicles. There is no doubt that the older the car, the greater the attention is needed to keep it fit in all respects. I know; mine is a five-year old car. It is common sense that cars with defects in safety aspects should be kept off the highways until the defects have been cured. What does it avail a driver of a car with proper brakes, headlights, tires, windshield wiper, steering gear, if there are vehicles which fail in these respects on the same highway with him? A certificate of motor vehicle fitness, at no matter what intervals of time in the life of the car, will lead to a greater safety.

It is small compensation to a careful driver with a fit motor vehicle to know that in a court of law a judgment will be awarded to him because another is at fault. I have yet to meet anyone happy about an accident, even if he was in the right.

Mr. Speaker, our aim should be that a person can leave his home in his car bound for his shop or office, for his friends' home, for his summer vacation, with the chances loaded very heavily in his favour of a safe return.

A year ago I spoke of the excellent work of the night school classes carried on throughout this Province, and particularly in the City of Toronto, in respect to the training of newcomers in citizenship and the English language. The value of that work is indisputable. That perhaps is one of the most important phases of the integration of these newcomers into the Canadian way of life.

Recent circumstances have indicated that that program may be jeopardized. The people of the City of Toronto have been very generous since the inception of the program; from the very beginning they have paid the deficit which last year amounted to some $100,000. This Administration

has seen fit to contribute to the extent of one-half . the cost of the teachers' salaries, which last year amounted to some $50,000. The remainder, Mr. Speaker, is made up in fees. When the course was started, the fees were $1; last year they were raised to $5, and now there are indications they may be raised to $15 or $20.

Though there was no appreciable drop in attendance when the fee was raised from $1 to $5, it may very well be that such a drastic increase will prevent many taking advantage of these courses. It can be readily understood that newcomers who have to re-establish themselves from "scratch" cannot readily meet such costs.

The Board of Education of the City of Toronto has maintained, and rightly so, I believe, that these courses are the responsibility of the Federal Government, as it falls under Citizenship and Immigration. This has now been partially recognized, and it has been announced by the hon. Minister of Immigration, Mr. Harris, that the Federal Government has decided to make grants to Provinces equal to one-half of the grant by the Provinces. I am confident that the Province of Ontario will pass these grants along to the various boards.

The 50% grant will not solve Toronto's problem, and an increase in fees appears to be inevitable. It would be a false economy, Mr. Speaker, if costs were to be reduced by bringing about a reduction in the number of those who would attend. I can think of no dollar which can be spent in respect of newcomers which will bring a greater return than those spent on these courses. This is not a local matter, but is one of national importance, and I urge the hon. Minister of Immigration to reconsider the stand he has taken in this regard and also to pay one-half the cost of the teachers' salaries.

I am sure the Boards of the City of Toronto, and others will be only too willing to provide the facilities which they have, for the carrying on of these courses. If the increase in fees proves to be an obstacle, it will be the Department of Citizenship and Immigration whichwill have to bear the responsibility.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that some comment has been made in this House with respect to the few words in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of this Session. It is true, and everybody will agree with me, that very often the finest things come in the smallest packages.

I think the Government has today given a fine example of that, for out of the package presented to this Assembly and the people of Ontario, they have brought forth momentous matters -- the Metropolitan Bill and the unconditional grants to the municipalities. Based on an awareness of the needs and wishes of the people of this Province, and based on a knowledge that comes from intensive study and concern over the existing problems, this Administration has dealt fairly and squarely with them, and, dealing with these two matters of great import -- one of a local and one of a provincial nature -- the Government, through the various Departments, is simultaneously continuing its concern over many matters which pertain to the welfare of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this package, small in its presentation -- evidently a surprise package for some -- is one of which this Assembly can well be proud.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, may I, at the very outset of my remarks, extend my heartiest congratulations to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Connell) on their very fine presentations in moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne. I think both hon. members brought a lot of credit and honour not only to themselves but to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, some days ago hon. members of this Assembly listened with close attention to the very excellent address given by my leader, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver). It will be recalled that on that occasion he raised some important and serious questions in criticism of highway construction in this province, questions which I trust the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has taken to heart, and to which he will give serious consideration.

There is, however, another aspect of this matter of highways which the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not have time to go into the other day, but which I propose to deal with at this time. It is, I feel, in many ways equally as important, and in some respects more important in the minds of

the people of this province than mounting construction costs and total mileage constructed.

I am concerned about the safety on our highways, as I believe are all hon. members in this House, and all the people in this province. I am concerned, too, with what the Department of Highways is doing to make our highways and roads free of hazards for the motoring public, and I am wondering whether the Department is doing everything that can be reasonably be done in that respect.

I was very much interested in Governor Dewey's proposal that the New York State Legislature pass a mandatory auto-inspection law in his State. He is also concerned as to whether the State should set up its own inspection station or allow private garages to do the job. The State of Pennsylvania has had a mandatory auto-inspection for more than twenty years. Mandatory semi-annual automobile inspection has been effective in that State for the last sixteen years, and is credited by Pennsylvania authorities with preventing countless accidents. The law is enforced by State police, but some ten thousand inspection stations are regulated by the Department of Revenue, Bureau of Highway Safety.

As early as 1929, Pennsylvania law required that cars be inspected at least once each year. The 1929 law was amended by the Legislature in 1937. It became apparent then that one inspection a year was not enough, especially for motorists who were careless about keeping their machines in safe driving condition.

The inspection includes brakes, lights, steering, horn, windshield wipers, rear vision mirrors, exhaust system, glass and tires. The law bars dangling novelties attached inside the car, or travel banners or stickers on windows or windshields.

Inspection records show that approximately 58 per cent of the 750,000 cars checked require adjustment of some kind. After a machine is passed, a sticker is placed on the windshield. This is the only sticker Pennsylvania motorists are allowed to display. The sticker bears the number of the inspection station. If the car is involved in an accident or stopped and inspected by police and found faulty, a check is made on the inspection station to determine if the car was passed illegally.

Failure to obtain a sticker may bring seizure of the car and a fine. The machine is

not released from police custody until the owner has it checked and obtains a sticker.

Naturally, motorists outside of Pennsylvania are curious regarding the costs. A check of 500 consecutive inspections revealed that more than 67 per cent paid under $5.01; of these, slightly more than 47 per cent paid $1, and the remainder from $1 to $5. It cost approximately one per cent, or a sum of between $50 and $72.50 to bring their cars up to par.

The inspections are made by authorized garages. They are required to employ efficient mechanics, have certain tools and instruments on hand, and must comply with State requirements. Supervision of these garages come under State police.

Those assigned to investigate new applicants, or check on those already licensed, make periodic inspection of the facilities, experienced personnel and physical properties. Refresher courses are given State police, and station operators are urged to attend safety clinics which are held from time to time in each county. The clinics have been praised by the station operators who reported they keep them up to date on regulations and aid in

training new employees.

The regulation has created interest in safety throughout the commonwealth, and has caused the founding of advisory committees. These were established by the Pennsylvania Automotive Association. Their periodic meetings have brought recommendations for improving inspections, Pennsylvania officials said.

(G-1 follows)

Motorists who feel they are overcharged or that their cars do not need costly repairs may take their complaints to State Police. Investigations are then made to determine whether the inspection station is fleecing auto owners.

Administrative costs of the safety program have been self-sustaining for the last 12 years. The 4,800,000 stickers distributed annually at five cents each to the inspection stations bring in $240,000 or the amount needed for administrative purposes.

While the law has not stopped all persons from driving with glaring or out of focus headlights, poor brakes or other defects it has given police a much needed legal justification to bring such offenders into court. It has enabled them to investigate how the defective machine was permitted on the road and take effective measures to prevent a re-occurrence.

Pennsylvania officials admit they cannot determine the exact number of accidents which the inspection program has prevented. But their best proof that many have been averted are figures on necessary repairs to brakes, steering and other mechanical parts essential to safe driving reported by inspection stations.

They know that many motorists were saved from at least a minor accident, and possibly a more serious incident, if they continued driving without getting needed repairs. Most Pennsylvania motorists realize this as well and objections to the inspections are few.

Mr. Speaker, The Highways Traffic Act requires that commercial vehicles carry flares, lamps or lanterns that are to be lighted and placed in front of and behind these vehicles in the event they are disabled at night on the highway and thus constitute a roadblock or a danger to oncoming traffic. The Act specifies that these warning lights be placed at a distance approximately 100 feet in advance of the vehicle and at a similar distance behind it.

I submit that the same procedure should be followed in the case of roadblocks set up by the Department of Highways or any other department of contractor or group of workers who have to provide a roadblock on our provincial thoroughfares while construction work is being done on them.

I am sure we all recall that during the winter of 1951-52, the Department of Highways departed from its custom of placing only red warning lights on its snow removal equipment while plowing the highways.

Instead, it replaced, or augmented them, with blue flickering flares. I think I am correct in stating that the reason given at the time for this change was that the blue flare gave a more penetrating light, especially during period of snowfall or when the air was filled with snow particles as a result of the sweeping action of the plows. The Department also, I believe, exercised its authority to make its use of these blue flares exclusive so that motorists would know immediately what was meant when they saw them.

Those of us who have seen them in use know how effective they are, especially under winter conditions, and I think motorists everywhere have strongly endorsed them. Why could they not be used then, to protect motorists against roadblocks when construction on the highways is underway.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon.Minister of Highways should provide us with an answer to that question.

Roadblocks on dual-line highways, where speed limits are higher than on other roads, constitute a real hazard at any time, but particularly so at night in winter time when glaring headlights from approaching traffic and sleet, rain or snow contribute

additional dangers. I submit that extra special precautions should be taken under such circumstances to safeguard motorists from these barricades and every safety device the department is equipped with should be brought into service.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to draw to the attention of this House, another matter pertinent to the safety of traffic on our highways. There is a type of reflector-flare that the Department of Highways has approved for use at night to serve the purpose of a warning signal by disabled commercial vehicles that are a danger to oncoming motorists. Its usefulness depends on the reflection of the lights of oncoming traffic. I have been given to understand that the Department approved of it because of the large number of American trucks entering Canada in bond, many of which are equipped with this type of flare.

I am wondering if the Department is really happy about approving this type, known as the Vari-Flare. I understand there is some question about the validity of its use on Ontario highways. It was only after we had convinced the Department that we had one of these flares and that it was stamped, "Approved by Motor Vehicles Branch, Department of Highways, Ontario, Approval No. 56", that it would

admit such approval had been granted under date of September 22nd, 1952. But it also tendered the information that this certificate of approval may be revoked at any time upon thirty days' written notice.

I am informed that provincial officers who patrol the highways in the interest of safety are advising truck drivers that, despite approval by the Department, this type of flare is not effective where it is placed at curves in the road, and when oncoming cars are travelling at high speeds the driver of such car is given such a limited time to catch the reflected light because of its close-up to the ground location that he might easily over-run it before realizing its true significance. The old oil-type of flare which can be seen burning and flickering for much longer distances away from the disabled vehicle is much to be preferred.

I believe we all appreciate that much is being done, Mr. Speaker, not only through the Department of Highways, but through many other media of publicity, to make motorists safety conscious. The hon. Minister of Highways, I am sure, perhaps more than any of us, is aware that no matter how much has been done, there is still much to do. I am confident, too, that he will welcome any helpful

suggestions that will assist in the campaign to make travel on our highways safer and cut down the appalling number of accidents.

Admittedly, the situation is getting worse. The increasing number of registrations of motor cars, the consequent growing congestion on our highways, the tendency to travel at high speeds on our dual-lane controlled-access expressways, and a looseness in our registration of drivers are all contributing to the mounting traffic toll of death and injury and property damage.

The $64. question is: What can we do about it? Despite all that has been said, written and done to awaken the motoring public in particular and the people in general to the awful slaughter on our roads, it still is extremely difficult to find a formula that will stir them sufficiently to curb what one American editor called, "this national disgrace". Well, Mr. Speaker, one thing that we can do and we must do is to make certain there is no let-up in the public safety campaigns that not only have been established by the Department of Highways, but by other organizations such as the traffic squads in our various cities, by social service clubs and other groups, newspapers and other publications.

We must keep hammering away at this problem of highways safety until every person in this province who travels our highways, and walks our streets, is inculcated with the idea and is fully conscious of his or her moral responsibility. For it is plainly a matter of individual responsibility, and until we accept it as such and practice it as such, we will never be able to make much headway in reducing the staggering toll of accidents that annually assumes the proportions of a national disaster.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. member for Toronto High Park (Mr. Cowling) on his remarks on this subject in this Chamber the other day! I can certainly agree with him when he said:

> "Let each of us become better informed on this serious problem and let us spread the gospel of the golden rule in traffic and make motor vehicles travel in Ontario the safest in the world."

It is a responsibility that we should gladly accept, but one that will be seriously handicapped in its influence on the public mind if through any carelessness, whether individual or departmental, we fail in its application.

During 1952, automobiles claimed the lives of 102 people in the United States every 24 hours.

The price we pay in Ontario, if not as great, is just as appalling. Mostly through carelessness, criminal negligence and lack of courtesy on our streets, roads and highways every 24 hours of last year there were 2.76 deaths and another 65 people injured in accidents, or 11 deaths every four days and 260 people seriously hurt. The property damage was in millions of dollars. I am sure we will all agree that there must be no let-down in safety regulations and safety campaigns. On the contrary, there appears to be a great need for even stronger measures and safeguards.

I am wondering, too, Mr. Speaker, whether these super-highways, which the Department is constructing, or has under plan to construct, are as safe as they are thought to be. The Queen Elizabeth Way, in the early days of its construction, was heralded as the all-time solution to our main traffic problems in southern Ontario. I think we all realize now it was only a temporary solution. And judging from its accident toll, said to be worse than any other highway in Ontario. I think we must admit that it falls short of being ideal from the standpoint of safety.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to burden the hon. members with figures or quotations, but I would

like to read a few brief excerpts from an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Magazine section of October 18th, last. The article was written by Jay J. Dugan and originally appeared, I believe, in the Ford Times. In the Buffalo paper, it is headed:

> "Superhighways open way to New Hazards for Nation's Motorists."

It deals of course, with conditions in the United States, but I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that we in this country are also facing similar conditions. As we get more miles of superhighways into service here, we experience the same problems, the same conditions that our neighbors to the south are dealing with today.

I do not intend to read the whole article, as I said, Mr. Speaker, but only those passages which I feel serve as a warning to us, a foretaste of things to come when we in this province have a network of these divided-line, controlled-access expressways.

Mr. Dugan asks the question, "Are these superhighways safe?". He then writes:

> "Authorities say at moderately high speeds, Yes; at excessive speeds, No. Their design virtually cancels the causes of most accidents --

intersecting traffic, approaching few mishaps than average United States roads. Turnpike officials proudly point to Bureau of Public Roads' figures showing that for five years, the fatality rate on controlled-access, express highways in 12 States was less than a third as high as rural road averages. But, here is the hooker -- they kill more people per accident; or, as truckers put it - 'When you get it on one of these racetracks, you're a gone goose.'"

"The average 35-miles-per-hour, stop-and-go, city driver, they tell you, has not the conditioned reflexes, vision or distance judgment for sustained travel at more than 60 miles per hour. He doesn't project his line of sight far enough ahead to spot danger speeding toward him at 100 feet a second. Too soon, he's telescoped within a jungle of steel."

"Turn a driver loose with 100-plus horsepower under his right foot, a wide, dart-straight roadbed stretching into the diminishing distance, with only an astronomical speed limit to inhibit him -- and he does what comes naturally. Even geared-down drivers lose their speed sense after a while. With no telephone poles, houses, or other reference points to pace them, they unconsciously accelerate, sometimes disbelieving their own speedometers. This speed-blindness occasionally persists after the expressway is left behind, causing serious accidents on rural roads."

"The National Safety Council has analyzed the two most frequent accident types on expressways -- rear-end crashes and collisions

with stationary objects."

"The wide range of vehicle speeds on these roads causes most rear-end collisions, a council spokesman said, 'An overtaking car pulls out too late to pass the slower vehicle and shears off the other car's left rear-end. Or he cuts back too soon and punches in his left front.'"

"Modern highway designers are in the peculiar position of doctors who've cured many diseases only to find that patients are dying of the medicine. In eliminating most motoring hazards, they've created one of their own."

"The simple fact of superhighway travel is that the roads were designed for speed, but all drivers weren't."

That is the end of the quotation from Mr. Dugan's article, Mr. Speaker. I submit it leaves us something to ponder on in dealing with the safety problem of these speedways, or superhighways which we have been led to believe -- quite honestly so -- are much safer than other types of roads. As a matter of fact, any good road is safe with a safe driver at the wheel.

There is another point which I feel should be brought to the attention of the hon. members at this time. I mentioned a few moments ago that the Queen Elizabeth Way was merely a temporary solution to our main traffic problem in southern Ontario. In saying that, I am but voicing what the Deputy Minister of Highways told Toronto newsmen last October. He

said on that occasion that the Queen Elizabeth was overcrowded and would have to be replaced as the main western highway from Toronto because of the immense growth, industrial and residential,along its way.

It seems to me there is a vicious circle here somewhere. We construct these dual-lane highways to solve our traffic problems and first thing we know we have to construct service roads parallel to them to relieve their traffic problems.

It is characteristic, I dare say, in our rapid industrial expansion and growth of population that business and residential communities will spring up alongside these roads where transportation facilities offer fewer difficulty than in other areas. But commercial and domestic concentration along these roads means, in time, that more cloverleafs, more over-passes, and more by-passes, and, possibly, more bridges have to be built to accommodate these new municipalities. I need only refer to what is happening out around Oakville to illustrate that. I submit that highway transportation facilities in the Oakville area had more to do than anything else in attracting big industry to that part of the province.

(TAKE H FOLLOWS)

--- Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

The Deputy Minister of Highways has already made it known that his department has a plan for some 1,400 miles of superhighway. Since the department estimates the cost of these speedways at $400,000 per mile -- they may be $500,000 per mile or more by now at the estimate was made in 1951 -- it may be it is looking so far ahead that it is overlooking matters of more immediate concern nearer at hand such as the absorption of county roads into the provincial system. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) mentioned in his address, there is a backlog of some 4,000 applications from the counties already on file in the Highways Department awaiting some action.

Another question I want to raise, and one I feel deserves the serious consideration of the administration of the highway system of this province, is that of licensing drivers. I believe I have read that some thought has been given already by the government to raising the minimum age limit for drivers licenses. I don't know if this has been inspired by higher insurance rates demanded for teen-age drivers, or whether it is prompted by the number of accidents involving them. There has been wide-spread criticism of the driving record of teen-agers, although I believe I am right in saying they are responsible for only six per cent of the accidents on our highways. However, I am in favour of any move

that is made in the interests of greater safety and the best authorities agree that on the whole teen-agers are not as safe drivers as older people. They haven't the judgment or experience of older persons, although I daresay all of us know teen-agers who are good drivers and better by far than some older drivers we know. But the teen-ager's tendency to show off while at the wheel of a car is not so prevalent among older people, and I don't think we have room on our highways for the show-off.

It is obvious that no drive is perfect -- and that applies equally to pedestrians -- and it is obvious, too, that improvement can be made in the driving record of any age group. I submit that if we are to stiffen our licensing of drivers we should not confine it to teen-agers, but to all age groups. There should be a more strict examination of the fitness of drivers and in the precaution taken, before the issuance of licences.

A recent poll conducted by the New York State Association of Insurance agents on safety traffic measures received a phenomenal response. Returns tabulated revealed that 92 per cent of the motorists favour periodic inspection of motor vehicles and banishment of all that fail to meet safety requirements. Eighty-five per cent of those polled favour periodic examination of drivers to determine physical and mental fitness. Eighty-eight per cent would approve stricter licensing tests. Some 84 per cent believed

that there should be more stringent penalties laws, and most returns favored cancelling of a driver's licence after two accidents involving personal injury. Thirty per cent favoured cancelling after one personal injury, 54 per cent after two and 16 per cent after three.

I am not prepared to argue that compulsory automobile insurance is a necessary measure of legislation for Ontario, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that financial responsibility is an adequate substitute for moral responsibility. But I do think that compulsory insurance should be studied for whatever compensatory measure of protection it can give to the public. I am not recommending that the government go into the insurance business, although I believe the compulsory insurance experiment that the Saskatchewan government has carried on for the past three years has something of merit in it. The state of Massachusetts, which is the only one with compulsory insurance across the border, has had it for the past twenty-five years, and although it has the highest insurance rate of any of the states, the fact that it has put up with it for so long would indicate that it must have its good points too. A compulsory insurance bill is now before the New York State Legislature.

We have our unsatisfied judgment fund that has a measure of satisfaction in it, particularly as it is the only medium by which victims of hit-and-run

drive's can obtain any compensations. But that is not a final solution of financial responsibility in itself.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe financial responsibility is an adequate substitute for moral responsibility. But I do feel that every owner of a motor car, every holder of a driver's licence should be made to prove his or her financial responsibility before a licence is granted and not until such time as the licence holder has had an accident or has committed some violation of the traffic act such as reckless driving.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, there should be closer examination of the physical and mental fitness of all drivers of motor cars before licences are issued and a rigid policy adopted as to financial responsibility. I suggest that in the absence of any compulsory insurance measure, those car owners who cannot satisfy the issuer of licences as to their financial responsibility or who have no automobile insurance, should be compelled to display a sticker supplied by the licence branch on their windshield or some other conspicuous place on their car to that effect. I feel sure if that were done there would be a big reduction in the number of motorists who do not carry insurance and a consequent reduction in the number of claims against the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

One final point I would like to stress, Mr. Speaker, in regard to traffic safety is the matter of courtesy. Courtesy is contagious and that slogan is now recognized as one of the most effective means of accident prevention in the United States. I think it can be emphasized to great advantage in all our safety programs.

The idea is that if one driver is courteous, his attitude is contagious and spreads to other drivers. I believe the Toronto traffic squad is doing a great work in the schools and through various social organizations, church groups and elsewhere with a film showing how courteous driving can be an effective source of accident prevention. I think that is a great point to keep in mind for all of us. If we are courteous on the road and in our driving, the other fellow will reciprocate by our example and highway traffic will benefit immeasurable as a result. It so often happens that it is the discourteous driver who causes the trouble. If we can get at the source of that trouble we are going a long way to remove the cause of many of our terrible accidents.

In closing I want to impress upon the Minister of Highways that we in the Niagara District are exceedingly anxious to have the Queen Elizabeth Highway completed to Fort Erie. I have repeatedly stated on the floor of this Legislature the necessity for this. I realize that the Department takes the stand that 4,000 cars or more should pass along the

Highway before it is advisable to complete that portion. With our great influx of tourists in the summer time, this could easily be exceeded practically every day. It is to be regretted indeed the number of accidents that occur on the Queen Elizabeth Highway between Niagara Falls and Fort Erie. People going off the four-lane Highway still do not seem to realize that they are entering on a two-lane road and many serious accidents and some deaths have occurred. The hon. minister knows as well as I do the tourist traffic that uses that road, and the accidents which are happening, and he also knows the people are very anxious to have that highway finished, and I hope he will take that into serious consideration.

Just one more word in closing, Mr. Speaker, Some few days ago the hon. Prime Minister was speaking about the British-Dutch Relief Funds, I remarked on the floor of this Legislature that the people in the Niagara District had contributed generously, and I want to add my respects to the people of the Niagara District. We have now received up to date somewhere over $35,000 for that fund.

At the same time I want to pay my respects to the officials and the boys who are working on the Sir Adam Beck project down at the channel. As I said earlier, those men got together and asked the City for the arena, so they might have a "jamboree" there. A very successful jamboree was

conducted by the Hydro officials and all the boys who are labourers themselves, and at the end of the day, they were able to present to the City a cheque for $8,000 for this fund. As I say, we owe a debt of gratitude to the people of Niagara Falls and for the Hydro, for what they have contributed to our fund, and the fine way in which they are carrying on their duties in Niagara Falls.

(Page H - 8 follows)

MR. WILLIAM MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, This is the first time that I have taken the opportunity of speaking in the Twenty-Fourth Legislature. This being the case, I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the years of excellent service which you have given, as the ruling authority in this chamber. I might point out, that you are well on your way towards establishing a record for the occupation of that office, and certainly you have already established a record, in the capable, and pleasant manner, in which you carry out your duties.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and also your staff in and around this chamber, for the efficient and courteous manner, in which you receive all visitors.

From my observations, during the past ten years, both in session and out of session, thousands of people have visited this historic building, and they are well received, and favourably impressed, by you and your staff. I am sure all visitors leave this building feeling a little more proud of the historic tradition which it symbolizes.

I might add that many of my own friends from South Essex have visited this chamber, and I would like to quote from a letter of appreciation which I received a few days ago following a visit:

> "This is a short note to let you know how much I have appreciated the time and effort spent to make our visit profitable and educational. It was the first time that most of us had been to the Parliament

Buildings and it was very interesting."

On many occasions, Mr. Speaker, I have had citizens of Toronto ask me when the Legislature is going to have a night session. In past Legislatures we have had many night sessions, but no one knew in advance when these night sessions were to be held, and it was very difficult to advise anyone of the time of those sessions.

Now I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I will probably gain very little applause from my colleagues, in suggesting a night session, but I do believe , that if it could become the established policy of this Legislature to hold a night session every Monday night and, during those sessions, discuss important and interesting bills, or proceed with the debate on the speech from the Throne, or the budget speeches, we would open up the proceedings of this chamber, to many people living in this area, who would be interested in attending.

Many school groups visit afternoon sessions because arrangements are made ahead,based on the fact that we are in session. I am sure that local service clubs, women's groups and young people's groups, once they knew in advance that a session would be in progress, would interest their membership in attending.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be good public relationship on the part of the Legislature, to let the million people living in close proximity to

the Parliament buildings know, that we have established something for their benefit, enlightenment, education, and - on occasions when certain speakers are speaking - enjoyment.

When I look around this chamber I realize that there has been a big change in membership from the last legislature and, from my point of view, it is certainly a change for the better.

I would like to point out to some of the new members of the Legislature that in this chamber, as in other places, history has a habit of repeating. For instance, a week ago I was afraid that the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Wren) would speak on the deabte for three hours; however, he finished a little short of that time.

The only private member whom I remember speaking for three hours in this chamber was a very eloquent speaker, as is the hon. member for Kenora. He was also equally as inaccurate.

But the important point is - the member who spoke for three hours only lasted for one Legislature. He was elected in 1943 and defeated in 1945. He came he spoke and he vanished!

Those of us who have been members for a number of sessions, also appreciate the fact that one of our "splinter parties" has been reduced by 50 per cent. From the capable representation which is being given in this House by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko), and for the work he is doing among his constituents, I know that his popularity and enthusiasm will spill over into the riding of St. Andrew, and

I predict a further 100 per cent reduction in the membership of that party after the next election.

Mention was made of a game of "Musical Chairs" which has been played on this side of the House. I would like to point out that a game of "Musical Chairs" is played on that side of the House after every election and, as far as the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is concerned, we will always welcome his smiling presence in this chamber no matter where his seat may be -- in the west gallery, in the east gallery, or in the Speaker's gallery!

It is interesting to note that from the twenty-one members of the C.C.F. Party in the last legislature, we now have two, and those two are the most conservative of the twenty-one.

In the next election if the two hon. members further followed their suppressed inclinations and stood under the banner of the Conservative party, I am sure that their own winning personalities devoted to such a cause would secure for them the largest majorities they ever had.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to welcome to this chamber my good friend and neighbour, the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Reaume). He is not here today, but after all I tried very hard to bring him along in 1943.

I would like to give the new member every encouragement in his work and remind him that the history of the North Essex riding is very interesting.

The member elected in 1943 never returned. The member elected in 1945 never returned. The member elected in 1948 did not return. The member elected in 1951 holds his future in his own hands.

The Windsor City Council seems to be more reconciled to the Ontario Government since they secured direct representation in the Legislature, and I would like to quote from the Windsor Star on the reaction of the Windsor Council to the present government, and the heading in "Civic Orchids to Ontario".

Under this heading, we find:

> "The Windsor City Council which usually approaches a discussion of the Ontario Government with a harpoon in one hand and a spiked mace in the other, changed its tune last night."

Controller Atkinson, one of the members, said:

> "Some people in this Council like to keep banging away at the party in power, but I do not agree. I think they should be commended."

Controller Lawrence Deziel, who has frequently criticized the Ontario government on the ground that there is need for greater help from it for the municipalities, got his bit in as well. He said:

> "If you do not mind a word from a known Grit, the Committee did a good job. May I add to the words of Controller Atkinson, that if the Committee did receive a most courteous consideration, then it reflects a change in the attitude of Toronto toward Windsor."

(Take I follows)

Those of us who are private members are not charged with the heavy responsibility of dealing with the everyday problems of Government day in and day out as the hon. Ministers are, but we are here for a definite purpose.

We are here in the interest of our ridings, our municipalities, and in the interest of the human betterment of the people we represent.

It is our duty to bring to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister and his Ministers the needs of our constituents and the effect of new legislation on their daily lives.

Different to some Prime Ministers of the past, our hon. Prime Minister enjoys the full confidence of every private member of this party, and that is because he has taken every private member into his confidence. There are no secrets; there is nothing under the table.

It could also be said, from the results of the 1951 election this Government has the goodwill of the people of Ontario. With this warm-hearted confidence, I predict that during the next ten years, our progress in Ontario will be more rapid and more spectacular than in the past ten.

During the past year the Government of Ontario has been severely criticized by the Association of Mayors and Reeves. There is no doubt that the

burden of real estate taxation is falling very heavily on the property owner and, quite naturally, the easy remedy was suggested that the Province pay a per capita grant to ease the burden. This has now been done.

However, there is a tendency in making free and unrestricted grants to municipalities that the money is spent too freely. Municipal councils criticize school boards for spending too freely the money they have to levy. A week or so ago we saw in the Toronto newspapers where the car expenses of a Controller in the City of Toronto for one year amounted to $10,117.00.

We notice also that the Ottawa Council is going in for expensive roads.

We also find that many employees of the municipalities are being paid much higher salaries than provincial employees who are doing similar work for the Province of Ontario.

For instance, the police forces in the City of Windsor, Hamilton, and Toronto, are paid more than our Ontario Provincial Police. In our local municipal educational system we find that teachers are, in many cases, being paid higher salaries than teachers of superior educational

standing and wider experience who are serving the Province in the capacity of school inspectors, College of Education masters, and here in the Legislative Building.

Many municipal employees in our larger cities such as stenographers, bookkeepers, auditors, elevator operators, and so on, are paid on a higher basis than those who are doing similar work with the Provincial Government.

To raise the salaries of the employees of the Provincial Government $5.00 a week across the board would cost approximately 3-1/4 million dollars per year.

To raise this kind of money we would probably require some new form of taxation and this Government wishes to avoid, if at all possible, new and additional taxation.

Over the years I have heard many suggestions from the Opposition members that the Government should do this and the Government should do that, but I have never heard a suggestion in favour of additional or a new type of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to appear critical of the work which is being done by our municipal councils; they are actually really concerned about their taxpayers.

One thing we must remember, and that is that we are all working together for the common good, and no matter if the money is raised on a municipal level, a provincial level, or a federal level, it all comes from the same people.

It would appear in many ways that, from a provincial and municipal point of view, we create the conditions of activity and prosperity which enable the federal government to collect their huge personal income taxes corporation taxes, customs and excise taxes, and sales taxes.

For instance, in the automobile industry the sales and excise taxes collected by the federal government amounted to 138 million dollars in 1951. For the same year the wages and salaries of the automobile workers who produced those vehicles was six million dollars less, or 132 million dollars.

In addition to this, it must be remembered that the automobile workers also pay personal income tax to the federal government and, out of the wages they have left, pay sales taxes, luxury taxes, and excise taxes in the purchases of their everyday needs.

The municipal council where those automobile workers live, also pay tribute to the Federal Government through sales taxes. The merchants with

whom the automobile workers trade, also pay many types of taxes.

At the present time, these huge taxes are being used in a tremendous defence program. However, if by negotiation and agreement around the conference table, we find solutions to many of our present world problems, continued huge expenditures for defence may not be justified.

In this case we will be faced with the problem of devoting and directing our energies, as well as our national finances, to the development and improvement of municipal and provincial services and, of course, our growing social services. To prepare for that time, I believe that as soon as possible a conference should be arranged whereby representatives of the federal government, the provincial governments, and the municipal governments could sit down and discuss the problems of development and economic security which would, of course, include the complex matter of proper finance.

Many years ago, Baron Rothschild said, "Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes the laws."

And Reginald McKenna of the Midland Bank in England "They who control the credit of a nation,

direct the policy of Government, and hold in their hands, the destiny of the people."

In all our plans for the future we must make a study of the past. Under the Baldwin Act of 1849 a system of municipal and county government was devised, based on the conditions existing at that time.

The legislators responsible for this Act felt that they were dealing with two different types of community - urban and rural. They did not anticipate that in later years we would have problems which they did not consider at that time, due to the growth of suburban and metropolitan areas.

In order to think big enough in anticipating our future problems, let us for a moment look into the conditions in Ontario during the time of 1881.

In 1881 the Legislature appointed the Ontario Agricultural Commission to look into the economy of the Province. The report of this Commission can be found in the Legislative Library and consists of five volumes. For any member making a study of his own particular area, I would recommend the reading of these volumes as they do report the conditions of agriculture and industry at that time, 72 years ago.

From that report, I would like to make a brief reference to the picture of Essex County at that time.

"COUNTY OF ESSEX"

"Prices of Farms

"The price of farms varies according to the quality of the land, the improvements made thereon, and the character of the farm houses and outbuildings. First-class farms fetch from $30 to $65 per acre; partially-improved farms, from $20 to $30 per acre; bush lands, $16 to $30 per acre, according to the quality of the timber thereon.

"Timber Lands

"Nearly two-thirds of the county is still under bush, but there are indications of rapid depletion. No less than twenty-five mills are at work cutting whitewood (tulip), oak, ash, elm hickory, bass, sycamore, and other woods for exportation as lumber to the United States, where it is used for various manufacturing purposes.

"This industry, it is said, brings into the county every year over half a million of dollars, and gives employment to large numbers of workmen during the winter - in fact, to the extent of leaving none unemployed.

"Charcoal burning is also a newly developed industry, which must help to diminish the area of uncleared land. There are thirty charcoal kilns in the county, consuming 600 cords of wood weekly. The charcoal is shipped to the United States and used for iron smelting.

"Other Local Industries

"The female descendants of the early French settlers in this county are experts in the braiding of straw hats and in the knitting of woollen socks. These two industries are estimated to produce about $95,000 annually - the city of Detroit having, it is stated, paid the French-Canadian women of Essex $80,000 last year for straw braid alone. The braid is also exported to the East and even to South America and Mexico, where it is made up into fashionable shapes and commands a ready sale.

"A manufactory has been in operation at Walkerville, for the last two years, for the production of Glucose (grape sugar). Glucose is used in the brewing of lager beer and in the manufacture of confectionery. Combined with syrup of sorghum, it will probably be extensively used in the production of molasses, a common grade of which is already made by Essex farmers exclusively from the sorghum.

"The cultivation of sorghum has already been so successfully prosecuted that one farmer is reported to be growing five or six acres, which yield him six barrels, or about 300 gallons per acre. This is sold at about 50 cents per gallon.

"The Early Amber sugar cane is also being introduced, and hopes are entertained that sugar-making will, hereafter, be carried on on a large scale.

"A not unimportant industry, and one likely to have increased development, is that of the fishery on the rivers and lakes bordering three sides of the county. The fish hatchery at Sandwich will probably be the means of maintaining the supply of fish, and, perhaps, of increasing it. It is estimated that the whitefish and herring caught in these waters have an annual value of $60,000.

"Bee-keeping on the best known scientific principles, is beginning to attract attention as an industry. Though, as yet, carried on in a small way, the experiment is pronounced to be entirely successful.

"Population.

"The population of Essex, according to the census of 1871, was 32,697."

I have already mentioned that the automobile industry in Canada in 1951 paid $132 million in wages and salaries , and that a large portion of this industry is concentrated in Essex County, as well as our diversified industry in Essex County and general farming activities, in South Essex alone.

(J-1 follows)

In 1951, we produced almost 60,000 tons of fresh fruits and vegetables. This amazing production consists of 33 different fruits and vegetables. Eleven of the 33 crops first see the light of day within four million square feet of floor area of greenhouses.

Along with the greenhouses growing cucumbers and tomatoes, as well as flowers, we have an area in South Essex alone, under glass, which, placed together, would cover more than 15 city blocks. Growers have more than 11 million dollars invested in glass and boiler plants in South Essex.

At the time of the 1881 report, from which I just quoted, the population of Essex County was given as 32,697 and today the population of Essex County, according to the municipal directory, is 227,276, -c- more than 7 times as many.

Along with this growth of population we have had the growth of many problems never anticipated by the members of the 1881 Agricultural Commission and the farmers of the Baldwin Act of 1849.

Looking ahead 50 years, it is quite easy for me to visualize a shortage in Ontario of agricultural land. We all know in our own particular areas what the addition of one million people to the population of Ontario since 1943 has meant in

the building of new homes, new industries, new schools, new public buildings, and new highways.

Thousands of acres of rich agricultural land have been lost to urban development. The new Windsor-Toronto highway with its width of 300 feet and length of 250 miles will mean that approximately 10,000 acres of valuable agricultural land will be lost for the purpose of farm production.

Sometimes, I think the wisdom of the present policy of the Department of Planning and Development in insisting on large lots for building purposes will certainly be questioned within the next 50 years.

I would like to give the House some of the conditions in Britain:

> "Britons must learn to live in tall apartment buildings and use the fertile land on this crowded isle for growing food, a government spokesman said today.
>
> Ernest Marples, parliamentary secretary to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, spoke in a Commons debate on the loss of rich farmland to housing projects -- estimated at 140 acres daily.
>
> Prime Minister Churchill warned earlier this week that the balance between population and food supply had 'tilted to an uneconomic, unwholesome and dangerous extreme.'
>
> Marples called on local and rural authorities to follow London's example in proposing to build apartment houses from nine

to 14 stories high.

Conservative Water Elliot warned: 'If the policy of building upwards instead of outwards is rejected, we shall only be building houses for people to starve in.'

Conservative M. C. Hollis said he agreed with rebel Socialist Aneurin Bevan, who said, 'we were moving toward a state of affairs when we should die watching one another starve to death by television'."

I am pointing out that we have to think ahead in Ontario, and we have to think "big", and with the jumbo-size building lot of 15,000 square feet, made necessary by the lack of sewers and drains, we are developing suburban areas in every part of Ontario where we appear to be perpetuating the use of the septic tank and individual wells. One of the difficulties of installing water works systems and drains and sewers and sewage disposal in many of our municipalities, is the fact that it is much greater than a municipal problem, in our fast-developing areas.

To cope with future growth, we must decide today whether we are in favour of annexation of rural areas to our large centres, so that services can be supplied, or the establishment of drains, sewers, sewage disposal, and water systems on a country-wide, unified basis. For my part, I am in favour of unification of services and the maintenance of our present form of municipal government, as opposed

to annexation or amalgamation.

Ten years ago, along No. 3 highway from Leamington to Windsor -- a distance of approximately 40 miles -- we had the Town of Essex, the villages of Cottam and Ruthven and, of course, the farming areas between them. However, today, 10 years later, this 40-mile section is practically all built up with residences, gas stations, restaurants, tourist camps, and other types of business. Similar conditions exist in many parts of Ontario.

Can we predict, Mr. Speaker, what this situation will be in 50 years' time? I don't believe we can. But we do know that Essex County will need water and sewerage, and the sooner the work is started, the better it will be. I believe, as time goes on, we can use the principles of Bill No. 80 and make them work, covering growing sections of our province such as the County of Essex.

Mr. Speaker, I see it is almost six of the clock, and I will just read some short excerpts from the Cumming Report, which I think would apply equally to the County of Essex.

> " The broad objective is to ensure the citizens within the area of a safe and abundant supply of water for domestic, industrial and fire protection purposes; to collect all sanitary

sewage and industrial wastes and treat same in such a way that Lake Ontario, into which the effluents will be discharged, may be made safe for water supply and recreational uses; the removal of all storm water drainage so as to prevent flooding; and the construction, maintenance and operation of all work necessary to obtain these objectives in the most efficient and economical manner.

The geological formation in Toronto and the related areas is such that wells cannot produce water in sufficient quantity and of suitable quality to be considered as a major source of supply. Thus the dominating element in this whole problem is Lake Ontario, both as a source of water supply with unlimited volume available and as an outlet for the discharge of all sewage, industrial wastes and storm water. Only six of the thirteen municipalities involved have a frontage on Lake Ontario, which must ultimately be the source of water supply and the sewage outlet for all thirteen municipalities. If no comprehensive and co-ordinated scheme is provided under a unified control the effect on the quality of water supply and health of the citizens may be highly dangerous and perhaps disastrous. It is extremely doubtful if the desired results could be obtained by each municipality acting independently of the others.

Lake Ontario has material advantages of great importance to the whole area. The lake not only furnishes an abundant water supply, but is used extensively for commerce and recreation. As the area becomes more densely populated, these natural advantages will become of increasing importance. The sooner a unified control is established over the whole area, the more efficient and economical will be the results in the end."

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that by changing the name "Lake Ontario" to "Lake Erie", those excerpts could quite easily apply to Essex County, where, as time goes on, I think it bids fair to become another metropolitan area.

I see, Mr. Speaker, it is six o'clock, and I appreciate the fact that many of the hon. members are anxious to attend the Speaker's dinner this evening, so I will withhold some excerpts I have about the riding of South Essex for some other time.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns the present sittings thereof, it stands adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister tell us why that motion is necessary?

HON. MR. FROST: The speeches in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the amendments thereto, will be terminated tomorrow, and I plan to bring in the Budget on Thursday. In the meantime, there are a number of speakers in connection with Bill No. 80 --

I think there are eight -- and I would like to proceed tomorrow. If the Government is sustained on the want-of-confidence motion introduced by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), I would like to proceed with the second reading of Bill No. 80.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has asked me to intimate to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that there is an indication in the township of a cut of 30 mills, which would seem to show that things are bettering themselves, and next year we feel sure they will be very much better.

MR. SALSBERG: Then we do not need the Bill No. 80.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the hon. Prime Minister intends to get to the second reading of Bill No. 80 tomorrow?

HON. MR. FROST: No, I do not think that will be possible. There are two speakers on the amendment to the amendment to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the vote, and I do not think there will be any possibility of reaching second reading of Bill No. 80.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:03 of the clock,p.m.

- - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XX

Wednesday, March 11, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M. C. Davies,
Speaker.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 11, 1953,
2:00 o'clock, p.m.

And the House having met,

Mr. Speaker in the Chair,

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. W. H. COLLINGS (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present an interim report from the Committee on Election Laws, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Collings, from the Committee on Election Laws, presents the

following as their interim report:

"The the Members of the Legislative Assembly,
of the Province of Ontario.

Honourable Members:-

Your Select Committee, appointed on March 28th, 1952, to act with the Chief Election Officer and the Assistant Chief Election Officer for the purpose of studying The Voters' Lists Act and The Election Act submits the following as an interim report:-

Your Committee held several meetings in the interval between Sessions and made substantial progress in arriving at recommendations for the improvement and simplification of the machinery for provincial elections. However, many provisions of the relevant Acts remain to be considered and several matters were reserved by the Committee for further study and deliberation.

Your Committee therefore recommends that it be re-appointed as presently composed, with the same duties and powers as were conferred upon it by the Order of the House which appointed it.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

(signed) 'W. H. Collings',

Chairman"

And this was also signed by the other members of the Committee.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 68 and 15.

Order No. 13.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session -- Mr. Frost.

ON SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in winding up the debate on the Speech from the Throne, as far as the Opposition is concerned, I want to pay particular attention to two subjects, but before doing so, I may be excused for making a few general remarks.

This debate, I would say, Mr. Speaker, has been an exceptionally good one. There is only one thing which I would like to draw to the attention of the House. I cannot help but feel that the rule which provides that a member should not read his speech is being honoured more in the breach than in

the observance, and I think, without being caustic at all, Mr. Speaker, that is to be regretted. I think it would be a very fine thing if hon. members could get away from the practice of paying too close attention to the written manuscript before them. It may be that those of us who speak with few or no notes, should have them. It may be we say things at times we would not say if we had it written out before us. But, somehow or other, it seems to detract from the speech itself if it is read by the one who is making the remarks.

I do not want to speak concerning any of the speeches we have heard, except to make an observation on one or two. I want to say to the hon. Minister whorepresents the Hydro Commission in the House (Mr. Challies) that we will be looking forward to his remarks on Hydro later on in the session, and I hope his remarks at that time will generate a general discussion on the whole subject of Hydro, not only the Comstock contract , but all other matters which have been brought up in this session. They should all be opened for discussion at that time.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in passing, that the hon. Minister might bear this in mind and be prepared to discuss it when speaking on the Hydro question.

I feel -- and I think the feeling is shared by many hon. members in this House and many people outside -- that the administrative costs of Hydro are away too high. We have come to the place in this province with regard to Hydro when all the speeches which are made, the radio time, the newspaper advertising, the pamphlets, the free meals and so forth, given by the Hydro Commission in order to foster what, in their opinion, are public relations, are in the greater part unnecessary. We are, in my opinion, getting too extravagant along this particular line.

I want to say to this House, and I think perhaps the hon. members generally will agree with me -- that Hydro in this province, as such, does not need to sell itself to the people of Ontario by an expensive and elaborate public relations department. Hydro has, in this province, a monopoly, and the great danger in this province as concerns Hydro is that we only know what they are doing in a general abstract way, and a further danger is that the monopoly will become monopolistic, and will have monopolistic tendencies which will not be good, of course, either for Hydro or for the people generally.

I do not want to say any more on this point at the moment, but I do say to the hon. Prime

Minister (Mr. Frost) that the time has come with respect to Hydro matters when the most stringent economies should be put into effect to ensure -- if ensure he can -- that Hydro rates will not be raised again in this province in the very near future. I say further to the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, that he will be doing very well if he can maintain the present Hydro rates until he decides to call another provincial election. A great battle will have to be waged in the months which lie ahead, and if we are going to have Hydro in Ontario about which the people will be proud, and which they will respect, I suggest there should be an overhauling as far as expenses are concerned, and those expenses should be pared to the very minimum.

Mr. Speaker, if I may refer for a moment to the speech by the hon.member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch). I think last night he made one of the best speeches c-- viewed from the Opposition standpoint -- which has come across the floor of this House. I remember him saying last night that due to the expense to which the Federal Government was being put for rearmament purposes and defence matters, it could not be expected to proceed at the moment in co-operation with the province in regard to relieving

the financial problems of the municipalities. But the hon. member held out the hope that if the war clouds are dissipated, and things become normal again, and the amount required for defence plants, and so forth, becomes much less than it is at the moment, there would be a desire and inclination on the part of the Federal authorities to join with the province in helping to solve this very vexing problem.

I am glad to see the hon. Prime Minister seems to agree with that, but I cannot see the day in the very near future, Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government will not be called upon to spend great sums of money for defence purposes.

I would say, as I have said in this House many times to this Administration, that its job is to get on with the task and do the job itself, in regard to the financial problems of the municipalities, and not be continually placing the burden onto another jurisdiction. This Government has one very firm and very fundamental responsibility in this matter, and it has the opportunity now to exercise that responsibility, and I rather imagine that tomorrow when the hon. Prime Minister, in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer, presents the Budget, this Government will have the money to go a long way towards relieving the problems which beset the municipalities of this

province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the administration of the Liquor Control Act. I was glad the hon. Prime Minister, in his remarks, called for suggestions as to how the administration of this Act might be improved, and might be brought more into line, and more into conformity with the desires of the people in regard to the administration of liquor legislation.

I would say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment, the public reaction to the administration of liquor control is growing, and there is an uneasy feeling that there has to be a revision in regard to the administration of the Liquor Control Act if we are going to maintain the support of the great majority of the people of the province of Ontario, behind the law, because if there is not support behind any law, or the administration of the law, then both the law and the administration fall down. So it is the duty of every one of us to point out, if we can, the weaknesses which exist in the Act, and the administration of the Act, in the hope that we can, by our pooled resources, and our joint thoughts, make a better law, and administer it better in this province of Ontario.

There has been a feeling in the past -- and I hope it has disappeared -- that when one speaks about the administration of the Liquor Control Act, and when criticism is directed toward the Act and its administration, you are accused of being prohibitionists, those who do not want the sale of intoxicating beverages maintained legally in the province of Ontario. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I am not in favour of prohibition, and neither is the Liberal Party, and I would say further I doubt if there is any great segment of people in this province who believe today that prohibition is the answer as related to the problem of liquor sales and the administration of the Liquor Control Act. Prohibition is not the answer, but I would say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the prohibition sentiments in this province will only be raised in a substantial manner again, when the people are aroused by what they consider the inadequacies of the Act, and the laxness in the enforcement of the Act itself. That will be the main thing, Mr. Speaker, which will bring into being once more, the forces say that prohibition is the answer to our liquor problem. I do not think it is. I do not think very many people in the province think it is. But I do say again that in my opinion there is a

growing feeling in this province that the whole machinery relating to the administration of the Liquor Control Act should be overhauled and should be brought up to date, to conform more with the opinions of the people in the province at the present time.

This uneasiness on the part of the people is brought about by a number of different things, and I want to outline them to the House this afternoon.

HON. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition a question? Is he speaking of the Liquor Control Act, or the Liquor License Act, or both of them together?

MR. OLIVER: Both of them, Mr. Speaker.

I would say to the House that the uneasiness we see in the minds of the public -- and I think the hon. Prime Minister sees it, to some extent at least -- has been brought about by a number of things, by the number of car accidents, for instance, in which liquor is a factor, by the number and variety of other criminal charges due to, or aggravated by, the improper use of liquor.

Another feature in connection with this

question is in some cases the premises in which liquor is sold in this province. I would say that, by and large, the premises in which liquor is sold for public consumption are good, and I think most of them are of a very high standard, but I say to this House it only takes one or two rotten apples in a barrel to spoil the whole lot, and if we are going to retain public confidence in the administration of the Liquor Act, then this small, even insignificant number, of places which are not good for any of us, and are not of a high standard, should be weeded out. That there are such places, no one in this House denies, and the people are asking how it is that inspectors will make reports on these places which will allow them to maintain themselves in their operation, and how it is that time after time, inspectors of the License Board will go on to these premises, to inspect them, and do not order them closed down until they are completely cleaned up.

Another matter which has aggravated the feeling in the minds of the public is in regard to the closed hearings. I will not deal with that extensively this afternoon, except to say that, in my judgment, all hearings in connection with these Acts, should be held in public, and made public, and under such conditions that everyone may go who

so desires.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if that was not cleared up before the Committee by the Judge, just recently?

MR. OLIVER: I think to a very large degree, and that is why I said I was not going to emphasize or labour that point this afternoon.

HON. MR. FROST: I am quite in agreement with what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said. I think the more publicity there is in connection with these things, the better.

MR. OLIVER: I am glad to have the hon. Prime Minister's agreement on that, because I feel very keenly, just as he has expressed himself.

Another thing which remains in the public's mind, is in connection with the applications for licenses. When a man wants to get a license, to sell this product in this province, he apparently thinks it is necessary to engage the services of a very outstanding lawyer, and one of the main recommendations which such lawyer seems to require, is that he be a very good Tory. It seems to be growing in the minds of the public that in order to get a license, one must have a lawyer and that lawyer must be a Tory, and the higher ranking Tory the lawyer is, presumably

the better chance the applicant has of getting his license.

I want to say to the House and to the Government this afternoon, that I see no real advantage, when a man goes before these Boards to apply for a license, in having a lawyer at all. May I suggest in order to correct this unsavoury situation, we might have in this province one who might be termed a "public advocate", one who could acquaint himself with all the information surrounding the application, and assure himself of the man's right to have such license.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I have been looking over a number of licenses which have been granted in this province during the past year, indeed, during the past three years, and I will be glad to hand the hon. Leader of the Opposition a list of the names of the solicitors, if any, who represented these applicants, during the course of the next week, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition will then find they do not follow any definite pattern at all.

MR. OLIVER: That will make very interesting reading, I am sure.

(TAKE B FOLLOWS)

MR. OLIVER: It will make interesting reading, I am sure.

HON. MR. FROST: I am going to send you that in the course of the next week. I have not sent him that yet, but I will do so, and I think he will find that is the case.

MR. OLIVER: I still say, Mr. Speaker, that there should be an office set up, and that it should be headed by an outstanding citizen of this Province, and that that man should be the man, lawyers notwithstanding, who would make whatever representations to the Board that should be made, and it seems to me that we would be going a long way towards correcting this situation if that were done.

I noticed the other day in the Sudbury Star, an editorial in respect to the administration of the Liquor Control Board, and I would like to read it to the House. The heading is, "Why Not An Inquiry?" It reads:

> "We are sorry to see that the Queen's Park Administration are trying to brush off criticism of liquor administration in Ontario when it comes not only from members of the Opposition in the Legislature but also from outside sources. A commission or a legislative committee to thoroughly investigate and study all phases of liquor administration in Ontario would really produce recommendations that could be implemented to dispel the cloud of suspicion and rumour that has developed in recent months".

That editorial goes on in like fashion; I do not want to read it all, but I want to suggest to the House in leaving this point that it seems to me that

it is time that we should have in this Province, as they had in British Columbia, an independent commission to go into all aspects of liquor control legislation and the administration thereof.

This Act, and its administration, has grown up over the years like "Topsy". It has been amended and changed from year to year, and it seems to me that the very best of purposes would be served by the appointment of such a commission, and by giving it the widest possible powers to go into this matter from "A" to"Z", and give recommendations that I am sure would help us in Ontario to build better liquor legislation and to build an administrative force that would command the respect of the people of the Province from one end to the other.

I say that seriously to the House and to the hon. Prime Minister this afternoon, because I am as anxious as he is about this situation, and I am just as anxious as he is to see that the best possible means were employed to bring about a betterment of the situation

HON. MR. FROST: May I ask my friend a question in connection with that question? It is a year and four months ago since we had a general election in this Province. I set out to make a speech on this subject in the town of Oakville one night, during the course of the election, and as far as I am aware, I am the only leader of any of the parties that were contending in this matter

that mentioned liquor to the people of Ontario. I would like to ask the hon. member when it has become so pressing within the last sixteen months that it is necessary to raise this point in this way when all the leaders, including my friend, never mentioned it during the course of the election?

MR. OLIVER: I would say to the hon. Prime Minister that none are so blind as those who will not see, and if he really believes that this Act is meeting with the approval of the people of this Province, then that is just too bad, it is too bad for the citizens of the Province, and it will hold back for a long time the corrections that in my judgment should be made, and I believe that in his judgment some revision should be made.

I will leave that with the House, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister wants to turn it down with a brush of the hand, and if he wants to just say that all is well with respect to liquor administration and the Liquor Act, if he wants to say, "We are as pure as the driven snow", then that is his responsibility. But as far as I am concerned I am saying to this House that I believe it would serve a very good purpose, indeed, to have an independent tribunal go into this question thoroughly and bring in recommendations which, I think, would make for better administration of the Act within this province.

I would like to say a word or two about the speech that was made by the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Kelly). I know that what I am going to say now will cause no uneasiness on the Government benches, and I do not want to do that, because after all, we are entering the stretch of this session now when we want to keep calm if we can and to assess things that come before us in a judicial way, even if we are not lawyers, but subscribe to the rural way of life. We will try to assess matters in an impartial and fair way.

The hon. Minister of Mines was speaking the other day, during which time he drew a very graphic picture of the future of this province, respecting the development of minerals in this province. I would like to go along with the hon. Minister of Mines in saying this that I believe Ontario stands on the threshold of mineral discoveries that would stagger the imagination of the people of this Province. I believe that the new discoveries that have been made lately will be followed by others of even more importance, and Ontario will lead the way in mineral discoveries and in the production of those minerals in the years that lie ahead.

One only needs to think of the development at Steep Rock, the development of the Bethlehem Steel in Eastern Ontario, the probable development in the Niagara Peninsula, and around North Bay,

and in all parts of this great Province, this Province in which we thought at one time that we had perhaps pretty well exhausted the mineral store. We are just getting into it, and the next ten to twenty-five years in this Province will mean very much, not only for the people who live in the areas in which the mines are located, but also the people who live in all parts of the Province.

I would say this to the House, that to me that is a very important aspect. It is not enough to say that we are going to have the minerals in abundance, but we can add to that that those countries which in all likelihood will buy the minerals that we produce, are going down so far as mineral production and mineral possibilities in their own areas are concerned. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how many hon. members of the House read the table prepared by Mr. Alan Bateman, the Chief Geologist of Yale University.

In connection with iron ore, the United States, according to this table, only gets two per cent from outside sources. By 1975 they will need up to 50 per cent from some other source than their own. That is true all down the list of minerals, and it indicates to me, and I think to the House, that a

very great development is in store for this province, if we manage that development in a way which would bring the best returns to the people of Ontario.

Not only are we going to have the minerals, but we also have beside us a country which is a very large user of those minerals, and if that country is in a position where it will not be able to produce enough within its own borders to supply its needs, which will be larger as the years go by, then it will have to turn its attention, and its buying to Ontario, which has these minerals in abundance.

The point I want to leave with the House this afternoon is that I think the time has come in Ontario, in view of this development, when we should sit down and decide just what our future policy is going to be with respect to mineral development and with respect to exporting minerals out of the country in their raw state.

One only need recall that a few weeks ago there was an announcement that the Inland Steel were going into the Steep Rock area and were preparing to spend some $50 million. I do not want to go into the ramifications of the agreement, but I simply want to say that American capital to the extent of $50 million is going into further developing the Steel Rock area. The trouble as I see it, not only with respect to Steep Rock -- I use that only as an example -- is the same throughout with all these things:

-- that the people of Ontario who in the name of the Crown own these ores and these minerals, are not getting very much out of them if they are shipped out in an unprocessed state to other parts of the continent, and I notice that it said in connection with this Inland Steel development that the ore boat will load Steel Rock ore from the Canadian National dock at Port Arthur. This port is 120 miles nearer to the steel mills at Indiana Harbour than Superior, Wisconsin, the shipping point for the Mesabi Range area, which will result in saving almost a day in each of the round trips.

Another thing that has interested me in connection with this Inland Steel agreement is that Inland Steel have other holdings in the United States, other iron ore holdings, and they have expressed their intention of holding these in abeyance while they develop and exhaust their presently acquired holdings at Steep Rock.

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that not only in regard to Steep Rock, but in regard to Bethlehem Steel, and in regard to all the natural resources that we are shipping out of this province, that the day has come when we have to sit down and decide whether we are going to continually allow these products to go out in an unprocessed form and not get anything for the people of the Province of Ontario.

In Alberta, as the hon. Prime Minister well knows,

that province had severe financial difficulties in the 30's, and it now is well on its way to being the wealthiest province in the Dominion of Canada, and they have secured themselves in that position because they did take a royalty on the production of oil within the boundaries of Alberta of one dollar per acre, and all that goes into the provincial Treasury for the benefit of the citizens of Alberta.

If that sort of scheme is good for the people of Alberta, then it is equally good for the people of the province of Ontario. I would say the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when not a foot of wood, or not a pound of ore should go out of this province in an unprocessed state,without first collecting a royalty for the provincial government, which the provincial government can use to the benefit of the people of the province of Ontario.

We are going to have continued developments along this line, and therefore a policy of that kind becomes more imperative and more urgent as the days go on. I think a policy of that kind would have two effects.

In the first place it would bring revenue into the provincial treasury, and in the second place it would necessitate those people who are developing our natural resources, processing them within the province of Ontario, and I would suggest to the House that that is sound business for this province. There may have been an excuse back in the 30's when

men were not willing, and did not have the need to export this material in its raw state, but that excuse has vanished in these days of prosperity, and it seems to me that now is the time to institute a policy in this province that will bring a fair return to the people of Ontario for the use of their natural resources, particularly where they are shipped out of this province in an unprocessed state.

I would like to say, in concluding my remarks, because I do not want to take very long this afternoon, that I intend to vote for the amendment to the amendment, and then I intend to vote for the amendment, and it will not cause me any sorrow at all if the result means the defeat of the government.

(Take B-10 follows)

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the final remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), I must say I feel very humble for the great responsibility that has been placed upon my shoulders, as I realize now the state of the government is really in my hands, in closing this address. It is a tremendous load to place upon an individual member, Mr. Speaker.

As is the custom, I want to extend my congratulations on continuing in the office of the Speaker of this House, which is a noble office, and I feel sure from the remarks from all sides of the House that have been extended to you, that everybody seems to be very satisfied that you are doing a most excellent job.

I would also like to say this on behalf of the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne that they were most excellent addresses, very well delivered, and as a matter of fact I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition that all the addresses this year has been most excellent, indeed, from all parties in this House.

It has often been suggested to me that we have in this House very weak opposition, and it has been my thought, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case. We have an opposition, weak in number, but not in quality, which led me to give a little further thought to just what happened at the last election.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition was leading his party extremely well, we on this side thought, -- as a matter of fact we were hoping he would not lead it any better than he had, but we thought things were going well. All of a sudden it seemed that the Liberal Party decided that, for reasons of their own, they should have a new leader. It seems to me they thought the old party needed some seasoning to make it taste a little better for the people, and I do not know how it happened, but I think they put the finger on the present Leader of the Opposition, and at any rate he did not lead the party. I will be very candid in saying I think it was a mistake, because I think had he continued to lead his party, that the opposition would have been much stronger in numbers than it is at the present time, because I feel he has always done a good job, but when they brought out this man Thompson, this fall, who ranted and raved around the country making, I think, one hundred and fifty speeches, the only thing I can say is it was a lucky thing for the Liberal Party that he had to stop there whether it was the time or not, b cause if he had had a couple of more weeks, he would have eliminated them, --

(Take C follows)

He actually would have because what was happening, Mr. Speaker, in all that campaign was, first, the people were thinking of the new leader, as the campaign went on and on, what happened? People started to laugh; actually they just laughed the Liberal Party down to its present status, and the chaff all went, and only the real wheat remained, and the "wheat," in spite of their small number, is carrying on a very good opposition. I feel that the Party still has a chance. It will take very, very careful handling, and it will be a slow process, Mr. Speaker, but they can come back in time.

Then, just a word in regard to the other Party, this small group sitting opposite me in the House. That Party rode the crest of the waves for a very short period of time. As the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has said, they were just "over-night guests here", but they did ride the crest of the waves for a short time, until the people detected the insincerity of that Party, with a result that now we have only the two hon. members left, and I will say without any hesitation, that the hon. members left are the cream of the crop. While the Party is as dead as the Dodo, the two hon. members may remain in this Chamber a long time, if they just clear their thinking a bit, and accept

some guidance from this side of the House. As individuals, they may remain quite a while and it would not hurt my feeling at all, if they did.

I feel I should now speak about the lone member, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). They used to consider themselves a Party. I do not know whether one hon. member is a "Party" now or not.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes.

HON. MR. DALEY: The thought that struck me is that for years the hon. member for St. Andrew and his colleague of former years attempted to hide behind this Labour-Progressive insignia, but that did not seem to work any too well and as their hidden motives were dragged out into the open, they have become bolder, I regret to say, until now I notice from the remarks made in this Chamber, that there is no question but that the hon. member is a Communist.

MR. SALSBERG: Of course.

HON. MR. DALEY: That is right, is it not?

MR. SALSBERG: Of course.

HON. MR. DALEY: I will not become personal, Mr. Speaker, because I find it is very difficult for me to dislike any person, and if the hon. member for St. Andrew was a little more moderate in his thinking,

it would be very difficult for anyone to dislike him, as a person.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that this hon. member came to this country many years ago without too much of this world's goods, and has done well here. I know quite a bit of the story of his background, but I will not labour that now. It is evident he has done well. He has enjoyed the freedom of our way of life, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has enjoyed more freedom in this House than any other member here, because of his nature. He is aggressive; he continues to press, and I think he "gets away" with more things and enjoys more of the freedom of speech than would be accorded to any other hon. member of the House.

MR. SALSBERG: I am for extending it to all hon. members.

HON. MR. DALEY: Yet, in spite of this freedom, and all the good things he has received and the good things of life afforded to him, what does he do? He comes into this Chamber and tries to inculcate into the minds of our people, his Communistic ideals and ideas. If what we read in the papers is true -- and I am no authority to say it is, and I find sometimes there are things in the papers which are exaggerated -- but from reading the

papers, we learn of the persecution of the Jewish people, first by Nazism and now by Communism -- the persecution of his own people. If that is true, how can the hon. member present to the people of this province, the propaganda, based on his Communistic thinking, because the persecutions, according to the best authorities we have, were carried on under the Nazi regime, and now under the Communists, on a scale never before dreamed of in the history of the world. His own people are being persecuted. If, by some stretch of the imagination -- and it would have to be a vivid imagination -- the Communistic theory was to succeed in this country, would it not follow that the same persecution would extend to this country, to take in the Jewish people here, and perhaps be broadened to include other races?

I may say, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to understand the hon. member for St. Andrew. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, our sons and daughters sacrificing themselves in the War. True, as far as Canada is concerned, the actual military personnel has not reached very large proportions, but the life of one individual killed in the War is just as important to him, as though there were thousands of others. As I say, Mr. Speaker, our young people are sacrificing themselves; our governments are

taxing for and spending huge sums of money which might better be used to improve conditions, to assist the municipalities, and to do many things to make our country even a better place in which to live, and yet we have to sit here -- and it annoyed me very much, Mr. Speaker -- last week, and courteously listen to the hon. member for St. Andrew give a discourse on the life of Stalin, and on the very day a picture of Stalin was in the picture, right beside it was the picture of one of our young sons who had been seriously wounded in Korea. Is there any sense in such a procedure being permitted in this House, that we, as members, with the exception of one, with whose ideologies we do not agree, and with the people whom he supports, we are at War, having to sit here and courteously listen to such a discourse. I do not know if it is possible or not, but if it is, I think that discourse should be taken out of the records of this House.

My duty, Mr. Speaker, is to wind up the debate, and in order to do a competent job, I should bring out some of the business which has been transacted since the last election, and perhaps just prior thereto, and try to convince the hon. members that this Government is worthy of being continued in office for another period, anyway.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I say that on November 22nd, 1951, this Government was re-elected to office, not because of the fact that the hon. Prime Minister had gone hither and yon throughout this province advising the people of the wonderful things he was going to do. As a matter of fact, he promised nothing other than he would continue to give good government in this province, and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, if this Government has a weakness -- and there may be some of which I have not thought -- it is its inability to advise the public as to just what this Government is doing from day to day on their behalf. We sit back; we do not shout enough from the house-tops; we do not inform them, but we go quietly about our work giving "Old Man Ontario" good government. We should do more to make the people realize just what they are getting.

Last year was an extremely busy year both for the hon. Ministers and the hon. members. As you know, there have been two sessions of the Legislature occasioned by the demands of public business. The election and its results has not caused any let-up, but in fact, an increased activity on the part of the hon. members of the Government as well as the hon. members of the House.

As I have already said, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, although small, has quality, and we respect them for their earnest efforts to do what they consider in the best interests of the people of the province. This Government has not by reason of this small, though efficient, Opposition, pressed forward or enacted things not in the interest of the public. Since the election, this Government has achieved more than any other government in the same period of time.

An agreement was arrived at with the Federal Government concerning the St. Lawrence and the International Joint Commission has issued an order which should permit the commencement of this great project very shortly. In addition, and I had a personal part to play in this as Chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission, we put forward an international agreement affecting the waters of the Niagara, in which the development of these waters for the making of power was established and at the same time consideration given to retaining the beauty of the Niagara. I am happy to say the meetings held in Washington were successful. We were to utilize the fall of the water and transform it into electrical energy and retain the splendour of the Niagara Falls as one of the wonders of the

world, not only for our own people but as an attraction to other people from different parts of the world. The examination of the Annual Report of the Niagara Parks Commission will disclose that people come from all parts of the world, and do enjoy this gorgeous scenery. One would be naive indeed if one did not realize just what this means to our province.

Today we have under construction one of the greatest power developments in history. This development will not detract from the beauty of Niagara Falls, but will create power for the further development of industrial projects, and at the same time opportunities for the people in this province.

In this year Old Age Pensions to everyone over 70 commenced to be paid as a result of the Federal-Provincial Agreement arrived at the year before. One might say, this is a Federal matter, but none can deny that if it was not for the desire and willingness to co-operate on the part of the hon. Prime Minister with the Federal Government in arriving at an agreement no such benefit to our old people could have been achieved. In my own office I have seen cases where difficulties seemed unsurmountable but when the parties sat down and discussed these difficulties together it was

usually possible to bring about a mutual agreement. I know this to be the attitude of our hon. Prime Minister when he met the Federal Government in Ottawa. He recognized there was a problem and sat down in the interest of all people, in an endeavour to work out something that would be mutually satisfactory. Because of this same attitude in the same year, Old Age Pensions with a provincial contribution to those between sixty-five and sixty-nine commenced January 1st. If this is not good legislation, then I have not seen good legislation, because it is an effort to take care of these people, who through no fault of their own, are not in a position to take care of themselves. This Government has treated its people in a humanitarian way and while there must be some restrictions yet I know the Department of Public Welfare, under the guidance of the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow), has given a broad interpretation of the Act. It is a source of great satisfaction to me, as a colleague of the hon. Minister of Welfare, to hear comments expressed in this House, as to the very satisfactory and humane way he has dealt with the problems of the handicapped.

A Rural Housing Corporation has set up and rural housing is being pressed in this province,

filling a long wanted need.

Loans and assistance have been extended this year to young farmers to assist them in their establishment in agriculture. We all hear it said -- the young farmers are leaving the farms; leaving the homes of their fathers, to enter into the industrial field which appears more attrative to them. I am not going to discuss at this time as to whether or not this is true, but I will say, this is the first effort ever made by any government to assist young farmers to establish themselves on the farm where they are assured of happy, contented and gainful employment. While I have not the figures before me, I do know that a great many young farmers have been assisted.

Aid to our municipalities was increased by $19 million, which was more than the amount of assistance given for nine years before.

While I am talking about last year's accomplishments, I do not think it is out of order to remind the people of this province that this government is granting payments to municipalities to assist them to improve the services of their firemen and policemen, and to enable them to pay more satisfactory rates of pay.

(TAKE D FOLLOWS)

Under this Act it might also be recalled that compulsory arbitration was no small achievement. Today we have throughout our province well-trained and highly competent policemen and firemen. Do not let us forget that at this session of the Legislature we are under the new Bill No. 80 changing from conditional to unconditional grants which will put into the hands of the different municipalities an additional eight million dollars. We are also reviewing additional grants to capital cost of schools which will enable municipalities not only to build needed schools in the area, but to compensate the teachers on a more satisfactory basis.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in view of what the Leader of the Opposition said in referring to the speech of the hon. member for Essex South, that additional grants to the municipalities have been, over the last ten years, I believe, increased somewhere in the neighbourhood of one hundred million dollars, $119 million, to be exact. That is getting into "big money" which has to be taken from the people in order to be given back.

We have poured considerable sums of money into apprenticeship training, realizing in this day of rapidly expanding industry that skilled workmen are a necessity. We are endeavouring by this method to give our own boys an opportunity to learn these skilled trades. I will have more to say on this subject when the budget is introduced.

In September a Federal-Provincial tax agreement with far-reaching results was entered into in Ontario, which lays the groundwork for a further rationalization of the Canadian tax structure.

Much has been said about the need of rental houses in this province and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that this government has made every effort to co-operate with the Federal government in the building of houses for rental, and I am advised that at this time there are over fifteen hundred units under construction.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips), in a recent address outlined what his Department is doing in the fight against cancer. The Cobalt Bomb has come into use in this fight and this government has entered into this field and has contributed large sums of money as the hon. Minister stated in his address

This government has adopted a policy of trying to prevent rather than cure mental illness. Over 200 beds for the out-patient treatment of mental patients in public hospitals are under way, and I believe the commendation of the people of this province will go to the Department of Health for this forward step. It is certainly much better to prevent than to cure.

The hon. Minister of Highways, (Mr. Doucett,) has announced at various times probably the greatest highway activities in the history of the province. I might add that I have been closely associated with

him for over ten years, and like you, am happy that he has completely recovered from his serious accident; that he is with us again to carry on the great work of his department. I am not going to go into any details regarding this program because I know that some time during this session he will be discussing this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all these accomplishments; with all this money poured into social services, this government has administered its affairs without having found it necessary to increase taxation; has balanced its Budget and the province has lived within its means.

Critics could say: "Oh! the government has been able to do all this because times have been good." Perhaps this is partially true, but careful administration of the funds available, the realization of the needs of the people and, in my own opinion, the fact we have a good government has encouraged peopl and industry to come here, which has helped to continue the high level of employment which at present exists.

Bill No. 80, with all its complications, has been discussed, and will be discussed further at considerable length in this House, and I say to you, where else in the world would you find a government faced with such responsibilities making every effort to find a cure for the many different problems. It has been said here it is ten years over due. I think I could agree more readily if the speaker had said - it is twenty years over due, which only adds to the difficulties with which the government

is faced. I feel sure an answer will be found at this session and the city will go forward and take its place with the great cities of the world.

I have no apologies to offer for these statements because they are factual, and all I can say is that this province is lucky to have as its head a man with such seriousness of purpose, and because of his love for people regardless of their colour, creed or place of origin, is determined to do the best he can for all. We are fortunate to have as our leader, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

(Take E follows)

The amendment to the amendment negatived on division:

AYES 9

NAYS 71

The amendment to the motion negatived on division:

AYES 9

NAYS 71

The motion agreed to on division:

AYES 71

NAYS 9

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that this House tomorrow resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that this House tomorrow resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 80, "An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area for certain financial and other purposes."

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

METROPOLITAN AREA

MR. E. L. WEAVER (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be so adroit in the employment of the device of suspense as the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg); therefore, at the outset I would say that I still feel complete consolidation or amalgamation of the municipalities is the eventual goal at which we should aim. I also shall say that I will support Bill No. 80, because I believe that in Bill 80 a plan is set up whereby we can achieve this goal of amalgamation or complete consolidation.

For some days we listened to the speech of the hon. member for St. Andrew on this Bill. The hon. member stated that, employing this device of suspense, he would withhold until the end of his speech the suggestions which he had to put forward as an alternative to those suggestions contained in the Bill.

---Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

During the first hour I looked around the Chamber here and I noticed that the suspense was telling upon my colleagues; I saw whitened knuckles gripping their chairs, and a look of great expectancy as they waited for this bombshell which was going to be exploded. I even noticed on

the more or less imperturbable countenance of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) a haggard expression. However, at the end of about four hours the bombshell was dropped and it turned out to be a "squib". By and large, Mr. Speaker, we had heard the story before. The suggestion of the hon. member was ancient material -- that somebody else should pay for it.

MR. SALSBERG: This Government, I said.

MR. WEAVER: Somebody else -- this Government, yes; in the municipalities this Government should pay welfare costs.

MR. SALSBERG: Right.

MR. WEAVER: Relief costs.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes.

MR. WEAVER: Fifty per cent of schools, $30 million.

MR. SALSBERG: That is quite a bomb.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WEAVER: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind. I think I can make myself heard over the din.

In addition to that the hon. member said we should cut into the provincial surplus; he mentioned $28 million and suggested that be tossed into the pot, and if that is not enough we should go to the Federal Government and get the

Federal Government to pay. He also said we should open the question of corporation income tax, put a corporation income tax on and pay for it that way. It sounds wonderful, but it is ancient material. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was to me very reminiscent of the views put forward by a certain candidate for the office of Mayor in Toronto. Some three or four years ago there was a man running for the office of mayor in the City of Toronto on the ticket of the Revolutionary Workers of the World party. I believe that is what he called himself; he was a Trotskyite communist, and I believe the hon. member for St. Andrew has nothing to do with the Trotskyites. However, this suggestion of his was very reminiscent of the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Andrew.

I attended an election meeting, and the astounded audience heard this candidate say, "If I am elected as the Mayor of Toronto there will be no tax rate, there will be no taxes at all; you will have no taxes." As I said, Mr. Speaker, it was a greatly astounded audience. Finally one of the members of the audience rose and said, "Well, Mr. Dowson, I am amazed at this. How are you going to do it, have no taxes at all?" The candidate replied, "My idea is that we will soak the rich

and have no taxes."

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, starting at the beginning, the Fathers of Confederation in their wisdom created this country on a two-level system of government which assigned to the provinces the matter of legislating in affairs that are purely local in their bearing, and giving to the Dominion the power to legislate in that field which is national; leaving with the Dominion also residual powers, having in mind the lesson of the American Constitution and also the lesson of the American Civil War.

Upper Canada, however, in its separate existence had delegated the purely local government to municipalities under the Municipal Act. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the course of the introduction of this Bill has already referred to the Baldwin Act of 1849. That Act, Mr. Speaker, is the charter of the municipalities, or is the commencement of the charter of the municipalities of Ontario. That Act, I believe, has been amended every single year in order to keep abreast of the times and with the changes and the developments in the already very complex life of the municipalities of this province.

Our problems in Greater Toronto are concerned

chiefly with co-ordination of the planning and development throughout this area of thirteen municipalities, and with the integration of the vital services necessary for this huge population of almost a million and a quarter concentrated in this area in one single and economic social community, which is disunited into thirteen individual political and administrative units -- a core and twelve splinters; or, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) so aptly put it the other day, a mother and twelve chicks clustered around her, or did he mention a duckling or two?

I say that the solution proposed by this Bill is one which is within the broad frame of municipal organization. It is broadened, but it is still within that framework of organization.

Several hon. members, including the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), have mentioned that the Metropolitan Council proposed to be set up by this Bill resembles very closely the county council. I would say that all the municipal services will be continued under this Bill, either by the Metropolitan Council or by the local municipalities. The local councils continue, in all of the thirteen municipalities, and, therefore, their councils

are partners in the Metropolitan Council.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I believe a complete consolidation or amalgamation is the eventual goal. However, I agree with the premise of the Chairman of the Municipal Board in his report on the application of the City of Toronto and with the premise of the hon. Prime Minister, that even if one does believe in amalgamation in the present state of affairs in this area, with the comparatively equal size of the mother or the core and the twelve chicks or the splinters, it is just not possible to wave a wand and by waving the wand, say, "You are amalgamated." The wand method would produce nothing but acute indigestion; it cannot all be done in one move.

There are two ways in which to approach the problem progressively; there are two ways in which you can achieve this goal. In the first place -- and I think the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) has this in mind, and also the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) -- the idea of progressive annexation working laterally from the core out, progressively annexing every year or two the fringe municipalities, and the next year or two moving out laterally and annex further fringe municipalities until you

finally have gathered within the metropolitan municipality all of them.

The second way, Mr. Speaker, is to proceed on a vertical basis, start with some basic services throughout the whole area and gradually build upwards, adding more and more of the basic services throughout the whole area until eventually you have encompassed the entire group of services into a complete and consolidated metropolitan municipality.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is adopting this second method, that this is progressive amalgamation. I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), when he says that he believes this is not the way but he believes we should proceed by progressive amalgamation, he can quite easily make peace with his conscience and vote for this Bill because it can be and it is the start of progressive amalgamation of the municipalities in this area.

This plan, I believe, is a good plan, and it is the only possible plan, and I, subject to minor variations which I shall advocate and which I shall deal with in Committee stage on the Bill, agree with.

A great deal of heat has been generated in

the discussions over the past few years with respect to the solution of the problem in Greater Toronto. That heat has been largely generated in the Councils of the various municipalities. I suggest if that heat is now harnessed -- and it will be harnessed in this Metropolitan Council -- and turned in the right direction, it will be possible through that heat to weld all of the thirteen municipalities in this area into one homogeneous metropolitan municipality..

It has been my experience, in talking to the various people of this area, that the vast majority of them feel that something has to be done, and they feel that something is being done and they are satisfied that it is a step in the right direction.

I have every confidence that when this Metropolitan Council is set up, when it meets with the various representatives of the thirteen municipalities, they will co-operate. I believe that over the trial period of the next twenty-one months we will see great co-operation, we will see a great change in the sentiment and the operation of the municipalities in this area. That is my hope.

I have every confidence that these municipalities will move along through this Act to their eventual finality -- a true metropolis, one and undivided.

MR. R. MACAULAY (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have listened, as have others in this House, over the past ten days or two weeks, with some interest to the speeches which have been delivered in relation to Bill No. 80 in connection with the Metropolitan Area of Toronto.

I am speaking at this time for a moment because I feel my obligation is to do so, as I represent many thousands of persons who are materially affected by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my prime responsibility is not to reiterate those very able speeches which have been delivered by hon. Ministers of the Crown nor the speeches which were made in relation to the general format of the Bill itself.

I should like to deal for a moment this afternoon with the two speeches which were delivered by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg), and to deal with them not in the way of personalities but from Hansard in the form of their opposition, for I feel there is some merit in their opposition to the Bill, and I should like to deal with their arguments in that way. For that reason -- although the hon. member for St.Andrew is not in the House at the moment -- I feel I

should explain that I am not attacking him, I am attacking his arguments. I have no desire to try to discredit him; I leave that for those who know more about his background.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the hon. member for St. Andrew and the hon. Leader of the Opposition collided, so to speak, in many of their objections. I counted the objections of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and they numbered approximately five or six, and they are analogous to those set forth, in many instances, by the hon. member for St. Andrew. I would like to deal with them in that order.

The first objection of both those hon. members was that this Bill fails to deal with the so-called entangled financial problems of the municipalities. It may very well be said, as was said by the hon. Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, that he too has hopes that the Federal Government will deal with the finances of the municipalities, together with the Province, and clear up what appears to be a financial problem. I do not mean to paraphrase; that may not actually have been the essence of what he said, but that is as I took it. I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that may very well be

true, but until a conference is called to deal with the redistribution of powers in tax fields, any statement that the Federal Government will, when they have the funds available, do something in relation to this matter is nothing more than a pious hope. That is his first objection.

MR. OLIVER: Does the hon. member not think the Province could do something in the meantime? What are you going to do with all your money?

MR. MACAULAY: I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I may have delivered a very bad speech when I spoke for twenty minutes on this particular subject sometime ago, but the very first objection I took against the suggestions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Andrew was that their first objection wandered from Rule 18 of this House, namely that one must debate the principle of the Bill which is before this House, and the general argument as to the aid to the municipalities can never hope to be found in a Bill dealing with a specific municipality. In short, what the hon. Leader of the Opposition was demanding of this Government, as contained in the Municipal Bill for the City of Toronto, should have been municipal aid to other municipalities throughout

the Province of Ontario. Although the hon. Leader of the Opposition is attempting to distract me, I was brought up by a debater for whom I have as much admiration as the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he will fail in his attempts.

I only say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he went off the rails in his very first objection because his objection was directed towards a multiple set-up across the province, and was not properly directed towards the Bill dealing with any specific municipality.

The second objection of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Andrew was this.

(F-1 follows)

(E-1 follows)

that there was no vote, and there is no vote on this matter, and there will be no plesbiscite. I interrupted the hon. member for St. Andrew when he was speaking and asked him whether he knew if a vote was taken at the time of Confederation, and, of course, he had to admit there had been none. But he did evince some interest in the debate at the time of Confederation, and suggested, as I understood him, that he was interested, but the hon. member said one thing when I was listening to him, and when I read Hansard, I found he had said another, and the Tribune thought he had said still another, and I imagine his constituents will think he said something entirely different. The hon. member said he was anxious to read the debates at the time of Confederation, and I would recommend them to him, because every division which entered into Confederation in 1867 was debated, and the Party to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition belongs, was the government at that time, and to determine an issue of that magnitude itself, and one which is difficult to explain, was placed fairly and squarely before the people without prejudice, and without any vote or plebiscite, and the suggestion that there be one, was nothing more than an invitation to this Government to shirk its responsibility, which it was unprepared to do.

I also asked the hon. member for St. Andrew what he would have done if one half of the municipalities had said "yes", and one half of the municipalities had said "no", and his reply, which was obvious, was that there should be another vote, and I want to suggest to the hon. member for St. Andrew that he does not want the Bill to pass this House.

MR. SALSBERG: Will the hon. member permit me to say just a word? I did not say we should have another vote. I said if some of the municipalities voted against the project, it would be for this Government to sit down with the municipalities and try to find a compromise and a solution which would be acceptable to all. I further added that this Government, if it wants speedy action, can find a way which would be democratic and acceptable without foisting it on them, and forcing it down their throats. I did not suggest another vote.

MR. MACAULAY: Mr. Speaker, there are two orders in this House; one is to rise on a point of order and state it, or to rise on a point of privilege. The hon. member has risen on a point of privilege and made a five-minute speech, and I may say to him that if he feels injured, I will make myself available between five and six o'clock, and sit out in the corridor and listen to him. In the meantime, I would

be very grateful if he would do me the courtesy to hear me out. I have said I have no desire to deal with personalities, but with the arguments which have been advanced. I have no criticism with what he said, as it is to be found in Hansard. If the hon. member wishes to rise and say that the vote will be conclusive, I suggest it will not, if certain municipalities vote for and certain municipalities vote against, for the reason that a vote will be nothing more than an invitation to the Government to evade its obligations.

MR. OLIVER: Does the hon. member know there was a vote taken at Windsor?

MR. MACAULAY: I have no knowledge of the exact details, but if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting there is an analogous problem, I cannot agree with him, either in size, quantum, magnitude or otherwise.

In relation to the third objection made by the hon. member for St. Andrew: I think he said that this Government was not trusting the people, and was not able to trust them. I never heard any hon. member in this House say that, because the people have tremendous confidence in this Government.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the third objection to this Bill made by the hon. member for

St. Andrew, and partially concurred in by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, was that this Bill creates a third level of government, and the hon. member for St. Andrew says that the members of it will not be directly elected by the people.

It is quite true this does, in effect, create a third level of government. That occurred to the hon. member as being a departure from municipal tradition, but if anything is to be condemned merely on that ground, we would not have any progress in any section of this province. Furthermore, if amalgamation, as was suggested by the hon. member for St. Andrew, is the ultimate aim then as was urged presumably by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the third level of government will disappear and it is only a temporary situation. But to suggest that members are not directly elected by the people is untrue. People who will serve on the council are elected as directly as the members of a city council for any of the wards, and it is, by analogy, similar to the county council.

My friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, -- and I say, "my friend" because I believe he is -- has said that the aldermen will be too busy, or may have no desire to serve, and so forth, and I said to him at that time -- and I think it is still true --

that if they are too busy, or have no desire to serve on the Metropolitan Council, they should not run at all.

The fourth objection by the hon. member for St. Andrew was that this Metropolitan Council will be headed by a Chairman, a sort of "Lord High Executioner", heading a body with enormous taxing power. One of the hon. members on the Government side accused the hon. member for St. Andrew of being loose with his facts. Well, if that is not being "loose with his facts", when he says it is not an elected body, I do not know what is, but that is only a red herring he is drawing across the trail. He has stolen the "Lord High Executioner" from Gilbert and Sullivan, and I do not believe they would be particularly flattered about it.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Chairman will be appointed, who will have some considerable knowledge of these matters, and will not have a vote except in case of a tie, and will only last until the year 1954, after which the Council is free to pick their own man from inside the Council or from without. The objection is nothing more than a technicality, but I suppose the hon. member for St. Andrew was in need of picking out some technicalities in his argument.

Then he goes on to the fifth reason, and says the people of Toronto will not have the right to vote on money by-laws. I can only repeat the answer made by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Collings) the other day and say that the statement by the hon. member for St. Andrew is only a half-truth at best. In addition, may I say there are many instances where a vote is not required for money for such purposes as schools, sewers, jails, hospitals, county roads and the T.T.C., for example. This is not an original departure, and to hear the hon. member for St. Andrew indicate that it sounds like a great departure, is rather astounding, but when looked into closely, does not carry with it any considerable substance. But even if it is a departure from municipal traditions, if it is necessary or advisable, are we to be condemned because it is a departure from tradition?

The sixth reason I could not find my notes upon.

In the seventh, he says he is not in favour of the Bill, because it does not extend the franchise to all those who vote in provincial elections, to those who vote in municipal elections, but I say to the hon. member for St. Andrew and perhaps also to the hon. Leader of the Opposition in relation to this objection, that it is not an

objection which should be put into a particular Bill; it is a province-wide matter, and must be dealt with in a provincial way, and cannot be dealt with in a municipal Bill, even if there was the merit in the position taken by the hon. member for St. Andrew. I comment not upon it, because again it is a departure from the municipal traditions.

The eighth objection concerns the question of the non-protection of employees. The hon. Prime Minister has already dealt with that, and has indicated that a Bill will be introduced in relation to it. I may say that the hon.member's objection was well taken, and I think it is one thing with which every hon.member in this House, in all sincerity, feels very much in agreement.

The ninth objection by the hon. member for St. Andrew was that this Bill was being foisted upon the people under the facade of rendering them a service.

MR. SALSBERG: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I did not use the word "facade".

MR. MACAULAY: You used the words, "This is a myth".

MR. SALSBERG: That is not the same thing at all as a "facade".

MR. MACAULAY: In relation to this problem, the hon. member for St. Andrew, in effect, is saying this Bill will not deal with the housing problem. Obviously that is where the hon. member for St. Andrew must come up for surface air at some stage, and really try to hit the nail on the head. He may try at this point to interrupt me, but this is the point which will stick him the hardest. The hon. member does not want this Bill to pass; he does not want any portion of it to pass, and he does not want the housing in this municipal area dealt with, because the people his Party breeds are people who live in garrets, and holes in the ground.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, --

MR. MACAULAY: If you are rising to a point of order --

MR. SALSBERG: That is for Mr. Speaker to deterime. You are not even a parliamentary assistant yet, but already you are usurping the powers of Mr. Speaker. I am enjoying the fun and the spectacle, but I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether a charge that a member is not interested in solving the housing problem is parliamentary..

MR. MACAULAY: I may be incorrect, Mr. Speaker, but I understand the rules of the House permit a speaker to have the right to explain a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The exact words by the hon. member (Mr. Macaulay), if I recall them correctly, were that the Party for which the hon. member stands is not interested in housing -- and then the balance of the statement was made. It might be necessary for me to consult an authority before being enabled to give an exact and proper ruling. However, I understood the hon. member referred to the riding which the hon. member for St. Andrew represents.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for St. Andrew has accused me of being indifferent to the conditions in the municipalities, but may I assure him that we are giving $100 million to the municipalities, and yet the hon. member still seems unconvinced.

MR. SALSBERG: In reply to the hon. Prime Minister --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. member says, in effect, that I am trampling on human rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MACAULAY: I think the hon.member for St. Andrew is unduly objecting. He says in his eighth objection that the reason is this Government does not "give a hoot" to what happens to the employees, or those who may be thrown out of their jobs. I do not

think I can be more convincing in regard to what this Government has done than from the fact that I hit so close to the truth, when I made that reference to the hon. member for St. Andrew. The truth hurts, but he had fair warning it was to be stated. If the hon. member thinks I was speaking about his Party, all right. The answer to that simply is this; we have some housing legislation in the Dominion of Canada which I have indicated I did not think was sufficient and even what housing legislation there is available today is not alone put into effect in the metropolitan area; it is used in Hamilton, in Windsor, and in other places. It is not being used here, because every municipality says, in effect -- and I am not accusing any of them of doing anything specifically but the general undercurrent of feeling is, "Why should we do it until they all have to do it, because if we do it, then everyone will pour into our municipality, and our municipality will carry the entire load for all the services, and for housing, for which the other municipalities do not pay." That is the real issue. That, I say to the hon. member, is the real issue in regard to housing, and I say to my learned friend --

MR. SALSBERG: Are you referring to me? I am not a lawyer.

MR. MACAULAY: I was always under the impression, from reading Hansard, that the hon. member considered himself learned.

Now I would like to make reference to an argument put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who advanced an argument which has been discussed on the North American Continent for thirty years, and with which it has taken treatise after treatise to deal. The hon. Leader of the Opposition concluded his speech with one wide-sweeping assertion that he was a believer in progressive amalgamation, and then sat down. I submit he has no understanding of the background of this matter, not sufficient to make as sweeping a statement to the public as he did, and perhaps the best illustration of his remarks would be if you had a boat with thirteen holes in it, all of them taking in water, any one of them enough to sink the ship, there is no use in saying, "Boys, fill up hole number 1".

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. member for Riverdale what he thinks of the Bill himself?

MR. MACAULAY: I think the question by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is fair, and it is quite proper that it comes from him, because it took him as long to come around to what he thought it was, as it has taken me.

MR. OLIVER: We have seen no indication of your viewpoint yet.

MR. MACAULAY: The last objection raised by the hon. member for St. Andrew was that it would result in an increase in the tax rates. That cannot be supported at all. They look for a considerable rise in taxes coming forward, but those of us on this side of the House, and our hon. colleagues on the other , do not believe it.

Then, the last objection by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Andrew with which I wish to deal is in connection with the fire and police. They asked why the fire and police were not included in this Bill. That shows what they know about the problems, because that is not the first thing to be included, but the last. The answer is quite simple, and I am honoured at having the privilege of giving that answer. The simple reason is this:

(1) The firemen and police do not build houses nor provide the things necessary for them which the other services which are taken over by the municipalities, do.

(2) The point the hon. Leader of the Opposition is always pressing is for the hon. Prime Minister to cut down costs,

in the outside municipalities.

Well, the cost of police in the Budget is $1,800,000, in the municipalities; in the city of Toronto it is $6,300,000. If the police were to be included at the beginning, they would have to spend the difference between the two amounts in the outside municipalities to bring up the standard or bring the police service in the city of Toronto down to the level of the other municipalities.

In relation to the firemen, the same analogy is true. In the outside municipalities, the figure provided is roughly $2 million; in the city of Toronto, it is $4.1 million, a difference of approximately $3 million. Again, either they will have to bring the standards up in the outside municipalities, or bring the standards down in the city of Toronto, and if the outside municipalities are raised, it will add on to the backs of the taxpayers approximately $8 million. That is why the fire and police are not included, (a) because it is not necessary at this time and (b) because it would produce the raise in taxes which the hon. members are afraid of. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has asked me the stand I take in this matter. I originally started my speech by saying I did not think I could usefully reiterate the speeches in

favour of this Bill, but to try and deal with the objections raised by the Opposition, although I believe that the C.C.F. will support this Bill.

I can only say that I support it because I feel from the bottom of my heart that in my riding -- and it may be true in other ridings in other municipalities -- people are living in the most desperate housing conditions, and I believe I should do nothing more than add my full approval and stand in favour of this Bill.

I, too, have amendments I think must be incorporated in the Bill, but I will vote for this Bill, and I will vote for it in the interest of the people, so help me God.

(TAKE G FOLLOWS)

MR. JOHN YAREMKO (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to say to you and to the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) that everything that he has said I would like to reiterate, but my approach, Mr. Speaker, will be slightly different. That there is a problem within this metropolitan area, of that we all agree, I am sure. The representatives of all of the neighbouring municipalities and the representatives from the City of Toronto have shown that, but not only the representatives but also the people themselves within this greater Toronto area realize that there is a problem.

Any man who gets caught in the traffic jams in the City of Toronto, and even up at Wilson and Avenue Road, any person who desires to have better housing knows directly as a citizen of this area that there is a problem, and everybody is agreed that an immediate solution is necessary.

It is only when we come to the type of solution that there is a divergence of opinion. On the one side we have the Toronto City Council who have advocated in the past amalgamation, and on the other side we have the municipalities in the area who, desirous of retaining their individuality, yet recognize that some unification of services is required.

That each side has presented its case very fully and very ably, is now a matter of history, and I, for one, do not in any way attach any blame

to either one side or the other for the position they have taken in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment them, because the two groups have presented the two main issues very clearly and very squarely. But just because there is a divergence of views, that does not mean that the problems should not be solved and should not be solved now. Would it be proper for this government to sit idly by and see a bad situation getting worse? Would we, the elected representatives from the city of Toronto and the neighbouring ridings, and from the whole province of Ontario, be fulfilling our duty if we were to sit idly by and not urge the government to take some steps now?

In Bill No. 80 I feel this government is carrying out its responsibilities to one and one-quarter million people. We have heard words used such as "ramrod","blitzkrieg" and "railroading", Mr. Speaker, and that is not the way I see it. I see the introduction of this Bill as action, which the people of this area have a right to expect, and action now.

It was in 1947 when Mimico passed the first by-law making an application relating to the unification of certain services. It is now 1953, time for continued discussion, but time for action, too.

I sincerely believe that in Bill No. 80 this government has given us a reasonable and workable solution. The doors are not closed to further

discussion and further action in the years ahead, but here we have created, through Bill No. 80, a form in which that discussion can take place simultaneously with action.

The inadequate and outmoded organization of this area will be a thing of the past when Bill No. 80 is put through. I believe, - and I have not been convinced by anyone or anything to the contrary - that the federation proposed in Bill No. 80 will work.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) tried to make the point in his address that comparison with a county council was not proper, because there would be such a diversity of municipalities within the metropolitan area, but when one examines the York County Council as constituted before Bill No. 80, there was a Council which seemed to work very well. As the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon) pointed out, it worked very well and within that Council there was a greater diversity than will be when Bill No. 80 comes into effect.

Bill No. 80 provides a structure which is inherently workable and I am confident that the type of person who will be serving on that council will see to it that that inherent workability becomes a concrete fact.

Surely the advocates of amalgamation, immediate or gradual, can have no serious quarrel with the principles of Bill No. 80. In this Bill are most

of the advantages of amalgamation and none of the disadvantages. The hon. member on my immediate right demonstrated to this House what drastic consequences would befall the citizens of Toronto were outright amalgamation adopted at the present time.

The tax rate within any community is the concern of all who represent that community, no matter at what level. I believe that Bill No. 80, with the unconditional grants to the municipalities and the metropolitan council will, at the very least, hold the present tax rate as it is today, and if there are increases in the future, I believe that it will not be due to the legislation brought down in Bill No. 80.

I notice that the city council of Toronto requested some assurance that there would be ultimate amalgamation of the thirteen municipalities. At one time, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I held this same view, and put forth the thought that time limits be imposed at which time transitition should take place, but on reconsidering, I believe that federation will work now, and there is no reason why it may not continue.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, if it does not work, the practical application and experience show that something else is required, the people of this area may be assured that appropriate action will be taken. This government is not sitting idly by now; it will not sit idly by in the future, and I might say that the type of person who will serve on this Council will be the first to

come forth with constructive suggestions, if it does not work out, but a form has been created in which within the minds of all the representatives who will sit on this council, an area mentality will grow up, not only in the minds of the representatives, but also amongst the people within the bounds of the greater metropolitan area.

Some expression has been made that this scheme might set a pattern. The hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) made some comment in a favourable light. Others have made comments in an unfavourable light that the continuance of a precedent being established in Bill No. 80 will arise. The precedent will only be set if Bill No. 80 in practical experience shows that it works and works well, and I bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that even before Bill No. 80 has gone into effect it has drawn the attention of people far and wide; it has drawn the attention of the people of Montreal who are faced with similar problems; it is now being studied by people who are faced with the same situation, the people of the City of Winnipeg, many thousands of miles away.

It has been amply demonstrated that unification of services and the federation created must and will provide housing for the land-hungry city of Toronto, and I go along with the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) in this regard, and do not agree with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in the same regard.

The people of my riding are no different from any other within the metropolitan area. They are hard-working conscientious people, concerned not only with themselves but with all the citizens within the city of Toronto and the metropolitan area. They look forward to the continued greatness of an expanding community. They know that their welfare is intimately connected with the welfare of all the people in the metropolitan area. They recognize that people live outside the boundaries not because they want to, but because they are compelled to, and that they are tied in with the community within the confines of the City of Toronto although they must live beyond.

While the population of the entire area has increased by some 15 per cent, the population of Toronto has actually declined, and yet the rate of increase in the suburbs has been more than 70 per cent. Since we all know that there are many persons living within the confines of the city of Toronto who did not reside there five years ago, it therefore follows that large numbers of people have moved out of the city of Toronto who for many years were residents of it. They have moved, Mr. Speaker, from every riding in the city, and certainly from the riding of St. Andrew as the hon. member for St. Andrew knows very well. There are a great many people who used to reside in the streets he named to the House as being the boundaries of his riding. He knows they have left, with others, within the past five years, and they

live within the greater metropolitan area now.

I am concerned about this, too, because invariably the people who move out of the city of Toronto into the suburban area are young people with young families. Mr. Speaker, there are many, many modest homes beyond the limits of the city of Toronto; they are people identical with those many hundreds of thousands who make up the broad backbone of the city of Toronto, and certainly people of my riding will not begrudge to those people a solution of their problems.

Yet this view need not be completely altruistic, for in Bill No. 80 the foundations for the future of the very people who continue to reside in the city of Toronto are also being laid. If I thought for a moment that the people of my riding were to be adversely affected, or that any of the people within this metropolitan area were to be adversely affected by the principles of Bill No. 80, I would not hesitate to so voice my opinion. But I firmly believe that Bill No. 80 is the exact converse; it is in the interests of the people not only within my riding, but in the interests of the people of the whole metropolitan area.

I must confess that I do not understand the talk that this legislation means confiscation of the assets of Toronto without compensation. I do not see anything in this Bill which indicates that each and every citizen of the City of Toronto will not have on January 1st, 1954, exactly what he has today.

This is not to say that there are not certain

specific matters which may have to be considered before the final crystallization of this Bill takes place, but I cannot understand a statement of that kind. People of my riding, of every riding, will continue to get the same supply of pure water, the same sewage facilities, the same transportation that they have received in the past, and on top of that, they will have those benefits which have been pointed out in this House.

I notice, too, that the report presented to the City Council by the Civic Commissioners, advocated that the hon. Prime Minister should guarantee all debentures issued by the Metropolitan Council for the next ten years, and here again I must confess that the idea was originally favoured by me.

(Take H follows)

However, after listening to the speech of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas), I can well imagine what his reaction would be if a certain type of action were taken in regard to the Metropolitan Area, and not throughout the whole Province. Surely the credit of the Metropolitan Council will be the same under this federation as it would have been under amalgamation. The assets and the people will be identical.

Mr. Speaker, again I am confident that the people who will be called upon to serve on this Metropolitan Council will administer the affairs of this whole metropolitan area so as to maintain the credit standing of the past, and, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, increase it.

Having recognized the broad principles of this Bill, my chief concern has been to see that the provisions will be fair to all, as far as we can possibly make them, and that everything possible be done for the smooth and efficient working of the Council for the benefit of all the people. That is my concern, and I am sure it has been the concern of every hon. member for Toronto and the Yorks, and also has been the concern of this Government.

MR. H. F. FISHLEIGH (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, when I first learned the details of Bill 80, I must admit I had a sinking feeling, but may I assure those in doubt that there is nothing a good night's sleep and an aspirin tablet will not cure.

Some of the Oil Companies advertise No. 88 gasoline; motor cars advertise "Buy No. 88 Oldsmobile." This means they are high-powered and have plenty of pep, so in passing Bill 80 we are passing a Bill which is high-powered,with plenty of pep.

I am not one of those members like the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), who can say, "I was born in the riding, lived all my life in the riding and my business is in the riding." I am just a country boy from Chesley who came to the city to try and make good.

When I was a druggist at Bloor and Yonge Streets, a customer after weeks of persuasion sold me on the idea of running for alderman. I accordingly was duly nominated eleven years ago. After I was nominated I did not sleep for three nights worrying about it. I consulted a lawyer to ascertain if I could withdraw but my lawyer said I could not; I would have to run. When the votes were counted I only had 150, and it cost me $150. Somebody said, "Fishleigh, why didn't you go out on the

street corner and give dollar bills away. You would have had more votes." The next year I ran again, and did a little better. This time I consulted an advertising agency. We fell upon a scheme of filling a large empty capsule with a note: "Don't take it now but take it to the polling booth January 1st and vote for Harold F. Fishleigh for alderman." This capsule was put in an envelope with "Happy New Year" on the outside.

I mailed ten thousand of these capsules to the voters in Ward III. That year I received 550 votes. The old ladies must have swallowed the capsules. That year I spent $550.

The following year I got down to business, rapping on doors, and I was elected over six other candidates and was alderman for Ward III for the next eight years, a ward that pays one-third of the total city taxes or as much taxes as all the outside municipalities; one skyscraper such as the Bank of Nova Scotia Building would pay as much taxes as four or five blocks of homes. I merely tell you these things to give you some background of my experience.

I remember in those days in the drug store we had a very smart laundry boy. He was a rosy faced youngster with red hair. I lost track of

him for some years, and was surprised to meet him in this Assembly as the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

Amalgamation or unification -- whatever you wish to call it -- is not a new thing. Soon after I was elected I realized that something should be done about it. I took it upon myself to do a little organizing. I wrote to the reeve and aldermen of York Township to appear with me before the Toronto Board of Control. I sent out about twenty other invitations, such as to the T. T. C., Board of Trade, etc. One by one they told me they would be out of town. The reeve of York Township did appear, but he just came to listen. I went up before Mayor Saunders myself, and he bellowed at me: "What is the difference in the assessment of York Township and the City of Toronto? How could you strike a tax rate?"

I had not thought of that; I thought all you had to do was to say: "Mr. Toronto you marry Miss York Township and live happily ever after." But, gentlemen, the most important hurdle has now been made. The whole area has been re-assessed so as to have equal taxation.

Several hon. members have stated the whole proposition should be put to the people. You know

full well it is not as simple as that. Many things have been tried to get the municipalities together. Elections have been fought on the issue and mayors and reeves defeated. It became such a "hot" dispute the Province of Ontario had to step in and bring the two together, and I believe the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should be congratulated, and not condemned, for having the courage to take the bull by the horns.

I do not presume it is necessary to state why we should have unification or amalgamation, as the facts are well known to all of us.

There is the extension of Spadina Avenue to link up with the Barrie highway;

The Don Valley roadway hooked up with East York;

The extension of Eglington Avenue -- there are over ten thousand trucks a day fighting their way downtown.

I believe, however, I would be delinquent in carrying out my duties if I did not refer to several changes which sooner or later should be made in the Bill. One of the opposition stated that there was an inequality in voting power. Swansea, a town of 8,000 people, has the same voting power as Scarborough with 75 square miles

and 80,000 people. I would solve that in this way: let Scarborough, North York and Etobicoke have two votes each and double pay. Let the Mayor of the City of Toronto and the two Controllers have two votes and double pay. These men have to campaign all across the city. The aldermen just have their individual wards.

Another curious theory about the Metropolitan Council is that the Mayor is appointed the first two years, and then he is to be elected, or he can be appointed if the Metropolitan Council sees fit. I think I shall start lobbying for that job right now, and that is exactly what will happen. You will appoint a mayor and he will lobby each member to be returned. The mayor should be elected after the two-year period is up. After Bill 80 is passed you will have a big mayor and a little mayor, but it costs ten to twenty thousand dollars each year to be elected as the little mayor of the City of Toronto for one year. The Bill has been prepared with all the legal angles covered, but the political end has been neglected. It is too bad some of the hon.members for Toronto were not called in to discuss the Bill previously.

This summer the City of Toronto will pass

the draft zoning by-law. The passing of the master plan, draft zoning by-laws and the effect of rent control have prevented the expansion of many apartments and factories in Toronto during the past two years. Likewise, the passing of the master plan in North York has slowed down building to a standstill. The have made most of the laws industrial, and the passing of Bill 80 will likewise slow down building in the Toronto area for several years.

For example I am on a committee to build homes for the aged. It will be January 1st before the Metropolitan Council can deal with the matter; it will be June or July before their estimates are set for next year; it will be fall or later before a trunk sewer could be built, and if it takes a year to build, it will be two and a half years before the old people can be looked after. That is not very hopeful for those in an attic, at eighty years of age.

The same length of time will be necessary for housing. It will be a year from this fall before trunk sewers go up Brown's Line, Weston Road, Bathurst Street, Yonge Street, Bayview Avenue, Leslie Street, Dawes Road, etc. However, if we did not have unification the delays would be

as great because they have not the money to complete the trunk sewers.

I do not like to think how long it will take to build sewage disposal plants. It took the City of Toronto ten years to build the $10 million one at Ashbridge's Bay, and it still is not functioning correctly. I believe a series of small sewage disposal plants would be faster and cheaper. In England they have a covered type which you can see from the train windows. One subdivision firm built one at Jane and Wilson to serve one thousand homes for $100,000. on the Black Creek.

There has been a plan for several years for storm sewers in the area, and I believe they should be started just as soon as the Bill is passed. They do not require sewage disposal plants.

The Toronto Transportation System, which owns the Gray Coach Lines, always presents a problem. Should the Gray Coach Lines continue to operate all over Ontario or should they be sold to the Greyhound Line and the money paid back to the City? The assets of the T.T.C. could amount to half a billion dollars, which will be turned over to the Metropolitan Council under Welfare. Relief recipients, which cost the City of Toronto a couple

of million dollars, will still be borne by the City. I ask you is this a fair proposition? I say the Metropolitan Council should take the bitter with the sweet.

Thehon. Prime Minister has stressed that we cannot have public housing unless we have unification, and the only public housing development we have had is the Regent Park development. The question is, do the people want public housing? If they are anything like the housing units I saw in England, then I would say no. Yet we are told the Metropolitan Council may go ahead with these without going to the people with a money by-law.

I will agree it is necessary to have a master plan so that we know where the streets will run, but it is necessary that there should be more speed. It takes a year to get a plan passed. Then, too, the outlying farms should be zoned in such a way that they can be quickly changed from residential to industrial or vice versa, to meet the needs of the prospective client; otherwise, the municipality might lose the industry. North York, as I said before, made most of its lands industrial so that houses and subdivisions could not be put on. This should be quickly changed also.

A Metropolitan Council presents complications.

Supposing you wished to have a Progressive Conservative picnic in one of the parks, or a pot hole on your street had to be filled in front of your home; you will call your alderman. He in turn calls the senior alderman, if they are speaking to each other. The senior alderman in turn calls the Roads Commissioner or the Parks Commissioner that a picnic is desired or a pot hole is to be filled. I only hope they will know where the park or the street is.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the older employees in the municipalities are worried about their jobs. In the City of Toronto we have a survey of all the employees as to their ability, years of service, etc., and they are all hired through the Personnel Department. This gives them security. I believe this Personnel Department should be transferred to the Metropolitan Council.

I will give you an example of what happened before this was put into action. One morning I opened the drug store at Bloor and Yonge, and twenty-five firemen came in for coffee, and requested an increase in pay. The practice was to lobby the aldermen and the controllers. One member of the Board of Control had carried out dozens of

requests, and was elected on the strength of this. When the Personnel Department came into being he was defeated.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for Bill 80. I love complications. We can trust our elected representatives; they will seek amendments from time to time. Ten years from now you will not know this Bill. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) said: "You are giving them a dose of medicine and making them swallow it." That is far from the case. We are compounding a prescription to the best of our ability; we are putting the finest ingredients in the medicine; we are compounding it with accuracy and dispatch; we put the label on the bottle with the directions, but it is up to the patient to take it. If the patient is not cured he may come back here and we will compound another prescription.

Yes, Bill 80 is a high-powered Bill with lots of pep -- more power to the Bill.

(I-1 follows)

---Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust the hon. members serving the rural way of life are enjoying this discussion this afternoon. I am sure they must be.

I would like to commend the Press for the really excellent job they have done over the past several weeks in bringing it to the attention, not only of the Greater Toronto Area, but to the citizens everywhere, as to just what we are trying to do here. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) mentioned today the matter of public relations, and I heartily agree with him that if we are going to put Bill 80 across to the people it is up to us to develop our public relations, and we must start right here to spread the good news of the benefits of Bill 80 to all the people in the area.

When I was on City Council in 1950, I voted for amalgamation, and I interpreted the set-up at that time as being progressive. That was brought very forcibly to my mind by the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) the other day when he finished his speech by saying that he was for progressive annexation or progressive amalgamation, and that is exactly what I am for. That is precisely what can be brought about, and

probably will be brought about by this Bill.

At that time I had the honour, Mr. Speaker, to discuss amalgamation in several of the outlying suburbs, and I was familiar with all the phases of it. I was also familiar at that time, and still am, with some of the main objections given by the outside municipalities, but it is a wonderful thing the way the objections to Bill 80 are diminishing; they are diminishing daily, and I am firmly convinced that by the time we get around to a final vote on the Bill we will not have any great objections.

This is not a cure-all, it is not a Bill to solve the whole problem, but, in my opinion, it is the best beginning anyone can submit.

Another thing the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned was that we should have begun ten years ago, and he said that even the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would agree with that. That was fine, but in the next breath he said: "Now, are we going too fast?" or words to that effect. I like to think, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has the courage of its convictions, and it is taking a courageous step. This is not an easy thing to do; it would be very simple to appoint a Committee and put it off until next Session and

at that time hold it over for another Session, and so on. That was done years ago, but we are saying that this is it, that we have arrived at the time where a decision must be made, and we are basing our political future on this Bill which we believe is the solution to the problem, and here it is. That seems very sound to me, and I am backing Bill 80 because, though it is not exactly progressive amalgamation or progressive annexation, it is setting up an authority to control and supervise the essential services which in time will lead to where the people want it to lead. We are not going to make the thing cut and dried at the start; let the people decide as we roll along. I like to use the expression which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) uses when he refers to "refinements"; it is a wonderful word, and so well applied to Bill 80. There will be refinements as long as there is a Bill 80; there will be refinements of the Bill as long as we live, so there is nothing troublesome about that; we are prepared to make amendments.

When I was referring to the Press, Mr. Speaker, there were several things that came to my mind, and for the benefit of some hon. members who perhaps have not had too much interest in the Bill or have not had the time to go into it thoroughly,

I would like to put on the record some of the things that the Metropolitan Council will control and the things that will be left to the local Councils. I think it is rather important that we should have that information.

The scheme has been compared to the division of responsibility between the Government of Canada and the ten Provinces, and I think that is very well put. We have our Metropolitan Council, with elected representatives, and, Mr. Speaker, I know at the time of the instituting of Bill 80 a great many people -- and I believe it was one of the main objections -- thought this Council was going to be appointed by the Provincial Government, and said to themselves: "My, we are going to have political control here." Now we see that they are going to be elected men serving on the Metropolitan Council, and they are answerable to the people who elect them. What could be more democratic than that? We have done exactly what everyone wanted us to do.

The authority of the Metropolitan Council would embrace the following major fields:

(a) Supply and wholesale distribution of water.

(b) Trunk sewers -- both sanitary and storm -- and sewage disposal plants.

(c) Present or future arterial routes which the Metropolitan Council chooses to designate as metropolitan highways. Includes snow removal, street cleaning, lighting and traffic control for these routes.

(d) Public transportation under an enlarged T.T.C.

(e) Financing of education -- both current and capital -- up to a minimum standard established from time to time by the Metropolitan Council. Selection and purchase of school sites. Approval of school building plans.

(f) Specified public welfare responsibilities -- homes for the aged, hospitalization of indigents and statutory support for children's aid socie . .

(g) Administration of justice.

(h) Metropolitan parks and recreational areas.

(i) Equal authority with local municipalities to engage in public housing and redevelopment schemes.

(j) Regional planning and zoning extending beyond the thirteen municipalities in order to control future urban development and maintain an outer green belt. Power to veto local plans, and to initiate subdivision plans.

(k) Management of all present debenture debt and sole authority to issue new debentures.

(l) Assessment of real property.

(m) Power to obtain from each municipality, on the basis of a uniform metropolitan assessment, the money for its current budget including debt charges plus the sums needed to pay debt charges on behalf of the local municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, briefly those are the things which will be under the direct control of the Metropolitan Council.

Then, the functions which will be under the exclusive control of the local municipalities are as follows:

(a) Policing.

(b) Fire protection.

(c) Sidewalks.

(d) Public health and sanitation. Financial aid to hospitals.

(e) Garbage disposal.

(f) Distribution and sale of electric power.

(g) Public libraries.

(h) Licensing, local regulations and by-laws.

(i) Direct levy and collection of taxes.

Subject to the authority vested in the Metropolitan Council, the local municipalities would also continue in charge of:

(a) Distribution and sale of water.

(b) Local sewage connections.

(c) Local streets, including snow removal, street cleaning, lighting and traffic control.

(d) Elementary and secondary schooling including the power to develop higher than minimum standards.

(e) Public relief, supplementary children's aid grants, day nurseries, and other welfare services.

(f) Operation of local jails, magistrates' and juvenile courts.

(g) Local parks and recreational facilities, boulevards, public squares. Civic recreational programs.

(h) Public housing and redevelopment schemes.

(i) Local planning, zoning and subdivision control.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, that local government has a lot of power and a great many things to concern itself with. I believe that as time goes on probably there will be changes and refinements, and amendments to adjust the areas of responsibility, both for the Metropolitan Council and the local Council.

I think one of the things which should be

considered, and the time seems very apropos, is for the various local governments to give further consideration to extended term of office. Just the other day in our Private Bills Committee we had the City Solicitor, the Mayor and the hon. member for London (Mr. Robarts) in regard to the London Bill. Included in that Bill was an extended term for aldermen and the mayor. Granted it was a staggered term; that is, an election each year, some for one year and some for two years. I believe the Metropolitan Council should have a two-year term or a three-year term, because their task is colossal; it is going to be terrific, and it is going to become greater as the time goes on.

I think if we are going to have any continuity of service we must have a longer term on the Metropolitan Council. I even suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a longer term on the local council, because I know it was my experience many times that the various aldermen and controllers would be particularly interested in something and would work on it for several months, and probably get the project around to where they could do something about it, and the first thing we knew we would be back into a campaign for re-election. I say if we are going to have continuity let us

extend the term. I believe we can give better government if we do.

This Government is a shining example; we have a four or five year term, and the people get good government.

I happened to be speaking at a church affair the other evening, and I was speaking on Bill 80, and during a conversation with a gentleman to my right, in discussing local problems in the church, he was saying, "We have a little problem here; this ladies' group and that ladies' group and the men's group, they do not just seem to be able to get together. They are all working for the common good, but they cannot get together." I thought how well this suited the present situation, Mr. Speaker; if we cannot get church groups -- the best people on earth, the church attenders, and the people who believe in the right way of life -- if we cannot get them together on small issues, how can we expect the ordinary taxpayers to get together on the larger issues?

We have heard a lot about votes. Some people say, "Let us have a plebiscite on the issues."

If, in the wisdom of the Metropolitan Council they want to call a vote in the whole area, who is to stop them? They have that right. The Metropolitan Council may have a vote and ask the people if they like it. However, in my opinion, now is not the time to do that. It is up to the Government of the Province of Ontario to give leadership, which it is giving, and after the control has been taken over by the Metropolitan Council it is up to them to decide what they want to do.

One of the things I have been particularly interested in, Mr. Speaker, is the taxi situation in Toronto, and that is something which should be considered in the overall planning for the Metropolitan Council. For instance, a licensed taxi driver in Toronto cannot pick up a passenger in the other twelve municipalities. On the other hand, if a driver picks up a fare in New Toronto,and takes them to the King Edward Hotel, he cannot pick up a fare in downtown Toronto. I believe in some cases it causes great hardship, and possibly in the wisdom of the Metropolitan Council they might set up an overall licence for taxis, together with some other licensing problems, and it could be solved. I would like to see some action on that.

A lot has been said about the Toronto Transportation Commission. The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) mentioned it. Many times I went with deputations to the Toronto Transportation Commission, as a member of the Board of Control I thought if the Council or the Mayor or the Board went to the Toronto Transportation Commission and said: "Now, in our opinion and the opinion of our traffic experts, such-and-such things should take place," the T. T. C. would do it. However, the T. T. C. did not do it, and that was their perfect right, and probably in the long run -- I believe in nine cases out of ten -- they proved they were right.

I personally feel that the enlarged Toronto Transit Commission will do a terrific job. The Toronto Transportation Commission have been operating for many years, and are recognized throughout the North American Continent, and throughout the whole of the civilized world, you might say, as the tops in transportation. I would not like to interfere in any way; let them continue to do a good job.

There has been a lot said about fire and police, and why were not fire and police included in this Bill 80. Out in High Park riding, just south of us, is the fine village of Swansea, and

that village has a volunteer fire department. I suppose some cold days the volunteers are not too snappy, and at times they have to call on the City of Toronto to give them a hand, and the City of Toronto is always willing to lend a helping hand. Our Toronto Fire Department are to be congratulated on their great show of hospitality and assistance in going to the aid of these suburbs in the event of a large fire. If that is the case we can rightfully assume, I believe, that the fire departments are almost under one head now; that is, they are operating together without actually including it in the Bill. Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, we have many important items to deal with, and when the fire departments are working along together so well, it will be only a matter of time before it will be instituted along with the other things.

The same might be said about the police. If our Toronto police are "hiking" after some criminal along the lakeshore they do not stop at the Humber Bridge and say: "Okay, Long Branch, you take over"; they keep on going and get their man. The same applies to the suburban police; they all work together. They are working together now, and they have a system whereby they

contact each other. That was shown at the time of the Boyd gang escape when all departments of the police co-operated in the Greater Toronto Area. That will take care of itself, and if the public feel they should join into one that will be done, if it is in the best interests of everyone. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is not required now.

On the Council it was my pleasure to serve on the zoological and botanical committee, and we had many meetings. We ran into trouble with the other municipalities in trying to locate a site for the zoo. It is my hope that when this Metropolitan Council meet they may get together and locate a good spot that will be satisfactory to everyone. It would be under the control of the Metropolitan Council, probably with some financial assistance from the Province. In this way we could build up a botanical garden and/ zoo in or about Toronto that would be a credit to this area. This is something that is long past due, and our Riverdale Zoo, down in the other end of the city should be changed. There are many people in this city and outside the city who are interested in getting some finality to this particular problem.

There was considerable comment about our Canadian National Exhibition. We are very proud of,

and we jealously guard, our Canadian National Exhibition, but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian National Exhibition and the City of Toronto must realize that the Canadian National Exhibition is just that; it is a Canadian exhibition, and although it is located in Toronto in our fine Exhibition Park, it is attended by people from all over the country, and they make their contributions to the Canadian National Exhibition. There are millions and millions of tourist dollars which come into our city every fall.

Although the Canadian National Exhibition is remaining with the local governments, I think the Metropolitan Council or the Province might consider a little closer tie-up with the Canadian National Exhibition. It could probably be enlarged, and perhaps some of our rural members could serve on the Board of Directors. I know in the old days the Exhibition was known as the Agricultural Fair, and it is the wish and the desire of the Exhibition to continue to promote agriculture, which is one of the main features of the big fair. That is something that could be considered.

I have here motions adopted by City Council at its meetings held on March 9th and 10th, 1953, pertaining to Bill No. 80, and there are quite a

number of them here. I would just like to comment on some of them to show the thinking or the changed thinking of some of the members of our Toronto Council, who were very much opposed to any implementation of Bill No. 80. For instance, one controller says that the Provincial Government be requested to amend Section 21 of Bill No. 80 to provide that employees of area municipalities who may be requisitioned under this Section by the Metropolitan Corporation, shall be guaranteed by the Metropolitan Corporation all rights of employment, seniority and other privileges presently enjoyed by that employee in the area or municipality in which he is employed.

Mr. Speaker, we have had that very well answered by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) a few days ago.

There is another one here by Controller Shannon, asking that the Provincial Government be urged to provide in Bill No. 80 assurance that the aim of the proposed legislation is the ultimate amalgamation of municipalities in the Metropolitan Area; and that failing such assurance, the Bill be amended to provide compensation for the sewage and waterworks to be assumed by the Metropolitan Council.

Who is to say we are not to have amalgamation once this scheme gets operating? We are not having amalgamation now; we are unifying services, but by making amendments this could work out to be amalgamation.

(J-1 follows)

By another Alderman:

> "That the Provincial Legislature be requested to amend Bill No. 80 so as to provide for the year 1955 and thereafter the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council shall be elected by a vote of the Electors of the entire Metropolitan area."

A metropolitan council would be free to do that, Mr.Speaker -- at least that is my understanding, but if at that time they want to have a vote, they can go ahead and do so.

Here is another one, by Controller Saunders:

> "That this Council advise the Provincial Government that instead of giving effect to the provision in Bill No. 80 for the setting up of a metropolitan council as such, to constitute a committee consisting of the persons named in Section 4, with full powers to affect complete amalgamation of the thirteen municipalities in the area by January 1st, 1955."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this government has the courage of its convictions and is making a start on it now, we are not putting it in the hands of a committee and leaving it over until 1955. I am sold on that one myself.

By Alderman Davidson, my good friend in Ward 7:

> "That this Council advise the Premier of Ontario that it is of the opinion that that the City of Toronto should be represented on the Metropolitan Council on the basis of population."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Aldermen on the Council in Toronto are not represented on the basis of population and never have been. Ward 3 has possibly 35,000 voters and Ward 9, North Toronto, 125,000, so that I do not see any reason why on the

Metropolitan Council we have to do something we are not already doing in any of the municipalities. There does not seem to be any particular argument there.

There are many more, Mr. Speaker. Another Alderman recommends that amalgamation should automatically come into effect on January 1st, 1964. He is a pretty wide-awake fellow, he is not tying himself down there too much, when we may have amalgamation in 1964 or possibly before that.

> "Suggested,that Provincial members should all briefed and supplied with copies of our Report."

A very good suggestion. We have got them and have been briefed and as has been said, Mr. Speaker, in a fine address,it is no secret that the Toronto and York Members have been meeting for quite some time and discussing this Bill and refinements.

> "Moved that local representatives in the Ontario government be briefed and requested to submit this report to the Provincial Government."

That is exactly what we have done.

> "Comment on the fact that while our assets are to be used by surrounding municipalities, we do not share in the benefits."

Well, Mr. Speaker, are they going to stop using the benefits in the City of Toronto? They are going to continue to use the water and the sewage, and use all the facilities they have there, they are not turning them over to anybody.

There are all kinds of suggestions here:

> "Believes that amalgamation is the streamed, simple, modern way of going about the problem. If unable to have such, then proposition as submitted, is one that could work."

There is no particular objection there, they are going along with it.

> "Assets being handed over and nothing being received in return."

That is the kind of "Dog in the Manger attitude they take, Mr. Speaker, speaking as a city member, I think we get a lot in return.

May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, bysaying e that we are agreed that in order for this section of our great Province of Ontario to exist on prosper, some definite steps must be taken to unify this area. Everybody is agreed on that, it is question of how. We feel -- and I am sold on the idea -- that this Bill No. 80 gives the know-how, it gives a beginning and it is my hope and desire that in the not too distant future we will all be just one big, happy family.

(Page J-4 follows)

MR. ARTHUR FROST (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I, and no doubt other hon. members, will agree with what the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) has said, that it must be very monotonous for hon. members representing ridings possibly one hundred miles, two hundred and three hundred miles away, and who are not so interested in the City of Toronto, to sit through these addresses, of which there have been three or four or five so far in the last day or so.

The matter of an application by the City of Toronto for the right to amalgamate with the surrounding municipalities in the Greater Toronto Area is, in my opinion, one of the most important municipal problems to face the Legislature in many years.

I feel, too, that our Government is fully aware of the problems besetting all the municipalities involved, and that there is a genuine desire on the part of the Cabinet to bring about a fair and equitable solution.

As a member of the Toronto City Council in 1949, when the decision to seek amalgamation was reached, I supported the then Mayor of Toronto in the firm belief thatsuch a move was in the

best interests of all the people. First, the matter of housing had become so acute, due to the almost total lack of suitable vacant land, that literally thousands were being forced out of the City proper, and many hundreds were compelled to occupy quarters totally unsuitable to their needs. Some of the adjacent municipalities had this much needed land within their boundaries, but with their limited financial resources they found it too great a burden to finance the municipal services in order to provide low-cost housing under the various Federal and Provincial plans.

The second major difficulty in the administration of the Toronto Metropolitan Area under thirteen governing bodies, was graphically illustrated by the experiences of the Toronto and York Planning Board, which found, after nearly three years of intensive study and hard work, that it had accomplished very little due to the difficulty of getting the suburban municipalities to co-operate on such projects as arterial highways, which are so sorely needed for the benefit of the whole area.

The third and perhaps the most important reason for Council's decision to apply for the right to amalgamate with the other municipalities,

was the unsatisfactory conditions created through lack of adequate water supplies and drainage facilities in some -- not all -- of the outside municipalities. For instance, seven of the thirteen areas are cut off from Lake Ontario and must rely on Toronto, Scarborough, or on artesian wells for their water. By the same token, some of these municipalities can develop sewage disposal plants, and the effluent from these plants can only be poured into the Don or Humber from these plants, creating undesirable conditions in both. Thousands of homes in North York have their plumbing draining into septic tanks, and when the heavy clay soil becomes saturated, they may produce a serious health menace.

In the City's submissions to the Ontario Municipal Board, it was pretty well established that the entire area had become a single community in every respect, except in its form of local government. Reference was made to the lack of adequate community planning on an area basis, the urgent need for unified control of water supply, sewage and drainage disposal, public transportation, and arterial highways, and the failure of the municipalities to agree on such matters as parks and low-cost housing.

On the other hand, the municipalities opposed to amalgamation, for the most part recognized the need for co-ordination of certain services.

The Municipal Board, in its report, concluded that there were many obvious advantages in a completely centralized and consolidated form of government which would follow the outright amalgamation of the thirteen municipalities. It admitted that the substitution of one government for thirteen would remove all existing divisions of jurisdiction and would undoubtedly expedite the planning, construction or acquisition of adequate co-ordinated water supply and sewage disposal systems, the urgently needed arterial highways, an extended public transportation system and other physical needs of the area. The Municipal Board also recognized that outright amalgamation would provide a solution of all the problems to the existing inequitable and illogical distribution of taxable resources and would make such resources available to provide the service needs of the entire region. It admitted that all borrowing powers would be concentrated in a single authority and capital expenditures could be planned and undertaken on a priority basis

according to need, and would be secured by the combined assets and taxpaying powers of the entire area.

Let me quote from the report of the Municipal Board in its summarization of the Toronto proposal for amalgamation:

> "There can be no doubt that a single government could provide the type of centralized control which is essential to the adoption and implementation of a sound program of capital expenditures and the need for such a program in view of the important capital improvements required in almost every part of the area is self-evident."

It is doubtful whether the need for reform of local government justifies and requires the complete dissolution of the existing municipal institutions and the creation of a form of government which appears to be bitterly opposed by eleven of the thirteen municipalities concerned.

A review of the Board's report indicates that long and careful consideration was given the matter by the Municipal Board and our well-qualified Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and it would be manifestly unfair for any hon. member of this Legislature to condemn the report on the whole after a casual study of its findings, and without the benefit of the large number of reports

and other supporting data submitted by the various municipalities. Nevertheless, the fact remains that we know from past experiences that the annexation of adjoining areas by the City of Toronto has proven successful to all concerned in the past.

Dealing with the four major reasons given by the Municipal Board for refusing the City's application, whether by an appointed body or a council composed of present elected representatives, the result must be a prolonged period of adjustment, in which there is bound to be an element of confusion.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living in Leaside, Mimico or Scarborough is as high, if not higher, than the cost of living in Toronto, and I have no quarrel with equalizing the wages of suburban municipal employees with those of Toronto's civic employees in comparable jobs. If an equalized assessment is to be made over the entire area, I can see no reason why residents in North York should not expect the same services as those of any other municipality in the area. Furthermore, the pressure from any one municipality would be no more pronounced on a single Council than it would be on a Municipal Council, as

proposed in the Board's report.

Finally, the Municipal Board feels that the existing municipal institutions should not be dissolved in the face of the bitter opposition from eleven of the thirteen areas involved. From my observation, it would appear that opposition to the Board's report and suggestions has met with more sustained objections than was the case when the City's application was under consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I compliment the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on the fair and equitable consideration which he has given to all parties and areas concerned.

We all realize the immense amount of study he has given to the subject of amalgamation of the Metropolitan Area. No one can dispute the fact that he has been most fair in all of his decisions and deliberations, and our prayer is that our Good Lord may grant him many more years to continue his fairness to all people and all parties.

May I also compliment the Committee -- of which I am a member -- on their complete study of all matters pertaining to the comprehensive, well constructed and very complete Cumming Report.

(K-1 follows)

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee, Mr. Roberts in the Chair.

HON. MR. FROST: I beg to notify the House that the hon. the Lieutenant Governor having been notified of the subject matter of the resolutions recommend them to the attention of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 8 by Mr. Frost:

"Resolved,

That,

> the Minister of Highways may direct payment to the Treasurer of the Metropolitan Corporation of the moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature of an amount equal to 50 per cent of the amount of the expenditure of the Metropolitan Corporation in connection with the Metropolitan road system which is properly chargeable to road improvement,
>
> as provided by Bill No. 80, An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area for Certain Financial and Other Purposes."

MR. OLIVER: Is there a sum mentioned of what this amount will be?

HON. MR. FROST: Yes. I have not the actual figure here. Of course you realize it does not affect the Budget. --

until next year because this legislation will come into effect on January 1, -- but speaking offhand my recollection is that it involves the expenditure of about $800,000 more on the basis of next year.

MR. OLIVER: Additional expenditure.

HON. MR. FROST: That is right. That is my recollection of the amount. I will check on that and I will be very glad to give it to the hon. member.

This, of course, relates to Bill No. 80. In connection with this, it is of obvious benefit to the City of Toronto, but on the other hand as my hon. friend knows in matters relating to education, it will work the other way. I would say that in Bill No. 80 this, together with the other unifications, have levelled out to a remarkable degree the entire picture.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 9 by Mr. Porter:

"That

> the salary of every full-time judge and deputy judge whose salary is fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall be paid out of such moneys as may be voted therefor by the Legislature,

as provided by Bill No. 77, An act to amend The Juvenile and Family Courts Act."

Resolution agreed to.

TOWN OF PORT COLBORNE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: House in committee on Bill No. 2, "An Act Respecting the Board of Education

of the town of Port Colborne, Mr. Morningstar.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 2 reported.

CITY OF OWEN SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second order, House in Committee on Bill No. 19, "An Act Respecting the City of Owen Sound".

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

CITY OF WELLAND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: House in committee on Bill No. 21, "An Act Respecting the City of Welland".

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A to J inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 21 reported.

TOWN OF BRAMPTON

House in committee on Bill No. 27, "An Act Respecting the Town of Brampton".

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 27 reported.

ASSUMPTION COLLEGE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The House in committee on Bill No. 10, "An Act Respecting the Assumption College."

Sections 1 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 10 reported.

SOCIETE NATIONALE DE FIDUCIE

House in committee on Bill No. 22, "An Act Respecting the Societe Nationale de Fiducie".

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 22 reported.

COMMISSIONERS FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 38, "An Act to Amend the Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act".

Section 1 agreed to, section 2 as amended agreed to, section 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 38 reported.

COUNTY JUDGE'S ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 43, "An Act to Amend the County Judge's Act."

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 43 reported.

(Take L follows)

THE GENERAL SESSIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixteenth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 44, "An Act to amend The General Sessions Act", Mr. Porter.

Section 1 (as amended) to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 44 reported.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventeenth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend The County Courts Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 45 reported.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE EXPENSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighteenth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend The Administration of Justice Expenses Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 46 reported.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Nineteenth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 48, "An Act to amend The Division Courts Act", Mr. Porter.

[illegible]

[illegible] Seventeenth order,
[illegible] Bill No. 46, "An Act to amend
[illegible] Ontario Driving Act", [illegible].

[illegible] referred to a Committee
[illegible].

[illegible] reported.

[illegible]

[illegible] Fourteenth order,
[illegible] Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend
[illegible] County Courts Act", Mr. Pettit.

[illegible] to a Committee [illegible].

Bill [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible] Eighteenth order,
[illegible] Bill No. 47, "An Act to amend
[illegible] Municipal Drainage Act", Mr. Pettit.

[illegible] to a Committee.

Bill [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible] Fifteenth order,
[illegible] Bill No. 48, "An Act to [illegible]
[illegible] Division Courts Act", Mr. Pettit.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 48 reported.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF BOOK DEBTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend The Assignment of Book Debts Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 49 reported.

THE BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first order, House in Committee on Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 51 reported.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-second order, House in Committee on Bill No. 52, "An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act, " Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 52 reported.

THE DEVOLUTION OF ESTATES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-third order, House in Committee on Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 54 reported.

THE MINING TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act", Mr. Kelly.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 72 reported.

THE CANADA COMPANY'S LANDS ACT, 1922

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 73, "An Act to amend The Canadian Company's Lands Act, 1922", Mr. Kelly.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 73 reported.

THE ARCHITECTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth order, House in Committee on Bill No. 61, "An Act to amend The Architects Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. S. F. LEAVINE (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, it is the Act itself we are taking objection to. This portion being added, does not subtract anything from our objection to this Bill.

HON. MR. PORTER: Perhaps we had better go into the Medical Act.

MR. LEAVINE: I am quite willing.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question which I raised before, and which I do not think was answered. I want to clear up my mind before I vote on this as to whether architects who form themselves into a company, will also be denied the rights which are obviously going to be denied to other companies. From my reading of this section, I come to the conclusion that no company can be formed, either by architects or others, and it would seem to me to go a little too far.

HON. MR. PORTER: That is what it proposes. The architects took the position that they are practicing a profession in a way somewhat similar to the lawyers. Lawyers, of course, are not allowed to incorporate into companies. They are subject to personal liability. I think the hon. members perhaps do not realize the position taken by the lawyers. All we hear about lawyers is that they have a monopoly, have a fence around them, never do anything right, no one can understand what they say, and it is hard to get in, and not too easy to get out. After all, lawyers are not allowed to hide behind a corporate structure. The same applies to architects, and I think it is quite right. I think

it also applies to the medical profession. Yet the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Leavine) is going to jump on the architects, and I suppose if there was a lawyers' Bill, he would be against that, too.

This is to protect the public, as well as the architects themselves. These men have to undergo long training in a university, and acquire a certain amount of experience, and they are trained to do a certain type of work, and they think it is for the protection of the public that they be not incorporated. They want that themselves.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not sure that the denial of the right to incorporate is a protection to the public. We are told that lawyers are not allowed to incorporate, but the public is not protected. That is why the lawyers got together and created a fund to reimburse clients who have no other recourse.

HON. MR. PORTER: If a lawyer is negligent, and a client sues, and gets judgment, and the lawyer being poor -- as they all are, because they live modestly -- if you take his house or his motor car -- if he has a motor car -- and take everything but the knives and forks and spoons which are permitted him to retain under the exemptions, he would have

nothing, so the lawyers did band together to afford some protection to the clients.

The architects say, "We do not think we should be incorporated;.we are professional men, and if we make a mistake, we are personally liable for it". I think there should be no objection to that.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): There is another angle I could add, Mr. Chairman, to what the hon. Attorney-General has said, and that is one architect could go with a group and organize a company which would work under the name of the one architect member.

HON. MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Grummett)is quite right.

MR. SALSBERG: But the lawyers do employ a fairly large number of articled men who do a lot of work, and the clients do not find out about it until it is too late to do anything about it. That is being done right along.

May I suggest, in view of the fact that the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Elliott) has a special interest in the amending of this Act, in his absence, as I think he represents a point of view which may be to some extent supported in this House, the Bill be not amended, until he is in his place.

HON. MR. FROST: Very well. It can be held over.

Bill No. 61 held.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. A. KELSO ROBERTS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills without amendment and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

Upon motions, the following Bills were given second reading:

1. Bill No. 1, "An Act to incorporated the Roman Catholic Bishop of Fort William", Mr. Mapledoram.
2. Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the Riverside Cemetery Company of Port Arthur", Mr. Wardrope.

MR. SALSBERG: I wonder if this would be the time to discuss the very important matter which a number of hon. members have raised in this House apropos to the formation of private cemetery companies. I am not prepared to speak on it, but I think a number of hon. members have raised the question, and they should be afforded an opportunity

of being here.

HON. MR. FROST: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is some legislation coming forward, which will afford the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) the opportunity of speaking on this question.

MR. SALSBERG: I was anxious to provide the hon. members with the opportunity of discussing this Bill.

On motions, the following Bills were given second reading:

Bill No. 16, "An Act respecting the City of Brantford", Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 20, "An Act respecting the City of London", Mr. Robarts.

Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting the Lakeshore District Board of Education", Mr. Brandon.

Bill No. 33, "An Act respecting the Hospital for Sick Children", Mr. Roberts (St. Patrick).

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Fourth Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1953, et seq.

0

Volume XXI

Thursday, March 12, 1953.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon,
Official Reporter,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, ONTARIO, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1953, ET SEQ.

Hon. (Rev.) M. C. Davies,
Speaker.

- - - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 12, 1953,
3:00 o'clock, p.m.

And the House having met.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: It is our pleasure today to welcome students from four schools in different parts of the province, the Strathcona Public School, Hamilton, the Long Branch Public School, the Runnymede Collegiate Institute, and from that part of the province of which we hear so very, very much in this House, the Lindsay Collegiate Institute. I may say that we are led to believe that Victoria County is almost the Garden of Eden, and I have determined to visit Lindsay and

Victoria County and see for myself if what they say about it is true.

It is indeed a pleasure to have these students with us on this very important day in the history of our province.

Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. W. M. NICKLE (Kingston) Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the fourth report of the Select Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Nickle from the Committee on Private Bills, presents the following as its fourth report:

" Your Committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:-

Bill No. 5, An Act to incorporate The Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of London.

Bill No. 28, An Act respecting the Town of Orillia.

Your Committee would recommend that the following Bill be not reported and would further recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted:-

Bill No. 8, An Act respecting Institut des Franciscaines Missionaires de Marie d'Ontario.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 5, An Act to incorporate the Young Men's and Young Women's Chrsitian Association of London and on Bill No. 28, an Act respecting the Town of Orillia.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Toronto, March 12th, 1953.

(signed) W. M. Nickle
Chairman"

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. Mr. Porter moves first reading of Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Judicature Act".

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is for the purpose of providing for an appeal from orders made by a judge in chamber. A recent case decided there was no appeal from such an order, and this Bill is for the purpose of providing for an appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by his own hand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor transmits the estimates for certain sums

required for the services of the province for the year ending 31st March, 1954, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, and transmits further Supplementary Estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending 31st March, 1953, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and this House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON.L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at this time in introducing this motion -- which I have had the honour of doing on a number of occasions -- I would like to say that this Budget which I am about to present has been in the course of preparation for nearly twelve months. It was shortly after the adoption of the last Budget, that the preparation of this Budget commenced, and, in fact, the preparation of the Budget to be presented after this, has been commenced as from this time.

During the course of these many months, working with my very able assistants, Doctor Walters

and others, the Budget assumed very formidable proportions, and the other day, in speaking to Doctor Walters, I complained of the fact that our Budget is now getting so large that the traditional method of introducing it perhaps might be altered, and the Provincial Treasurer might be given the opportunity of dealing with it in a little different way.

At that time, the Deputy Treasurer (Dr. Walters) who is a great student of the Bible, quoted the fifth verse of the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles -- and I refer it to all the hon. members, although they no doubt are familiar with it. This quotation referred to St. Paul, giving a great oration, on one occasion, and a young listener fell asleep, and fell out of the window.

With such a Budget as I am about to present, I would not want any of the hon. members to fall out of the windows or into the gangways in this Assembly, particularly the Opposition, which is small enough in numbers so we would not want to lose even one of them.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I will take the risk of setting a precedent in this House, and table the Budget. A copy of the Budget will be given to every hon. member, and they can

read it tomorrow and over the weekend and perhaps they might ponder over it in Church on Sunday, if the sermon proves to be as long as the Budget presentation. Although I feel I have to refer to the Budget document occasionally, I intend to do so as little as possible, in order that I may speak in a more conversational way to the hon. members of the House.

I would like to give the House a little outline of the problems we have had over these last ten years, and what we have done, generally, in a fiscal way to meet these problems, and also what we propose for the coming year which I feel is really a pattern for perhaps many years to come.

The reason I say that is that these fiscal arrangements were not designed to meet conditions particularly in any one year, but are designed to meet the requirements of the great and growing province of Ontario.

Our policy throughout these years has been one of maintaining economical accomplishments favourable to the industrial expansion of our province, and to prepare the way for a steady advance in our way of living, not for the privileged few, but as the people's government for everybody in this province of Ontario. That is our policy, and that has been

stated on many occasions.

May I say a word now, Mr. Speaker, about Ontario's growth. There are references to that in the Budget, and I think all hon.members know of the great increase in the wealth and development of our province. I think it is sufficient to say that at this time next year we will cross the 5 million mark in population. It is only a short time ago I told the hon. members of this House we would soon cross the 4½ million mark. This time next year, we will have added another 500,000 to the population of this province.

It was ten years ago when I became the Treasurer of this province -- 1943. Looking back over that period, we well remember we were engaged at that time in an all-out War, and in consequence of that, there was naturally a preferment in regard to projects in order that the necessary provisions should be made for the defence of our country, and the successful culmination of that struggle. As a result, we have had requirements in this province which have snowballed into formidable proportions because of the growth of population. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this back-log goes back to 1930. It can be said that many of the problems of Ontario as regards development and other things can be

traced back to the days of the early 30's, which when the people could not do the work which was required, and, subsequently, when they could not do it because of the conditions of War.

After the end of World War II, we were hampered by a shortage of steel, of cement, and other materials. Then we have been hampered by unusual international conditions; we have been hampered by the Korean War and other things of that nature. In the face of that, we have been met with the searching demands of the great dynamic people of this province. Since those days, we have given priority to Hydro , private industry, and housing. That was the sound thing to do, and I want to emphasize that we, not only intentionally, but as a matter of principle, co-operated with all governments, Federal and others, in providing for economic stability during those difficult days.

We have not endeavoured to make it harder for other governments; we have made it easier for all of them to meet their commitments in these times. In our ten years in office, despite War, despite the depression which preceded it, despite high costs, and the scarcities which we experienced during very difficult days, we have managed, nevertheless, to

carry out a comprehensive program indeed, and I would like to mention some of the things we have done.

First of all, I will mention very briefly, The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, and the expansion of power. During the past eight years, Hydro has experienced its greatest expansion since its inception 47 years ago. In the first 37 years of its existence, Hydro has developed a generating capacity of about one and one-half million horsepower; in the last ten years, we have more than doubled that, by adding two million horsepower, yet despite that, power is still on the short side in this province.

In regard to rural power: Mr. Speaker mentioned the banner County of Victoria and the Town of Lindsay a moment ago. I take great pride in the fact that I come from rural Ontario, May I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have witnessed in the last eight years, one and one-half times the number of consumers provided with rural Hydro, increasing from 136,000 to 343,000. That means that in eight years in the province of Ontario, we have extended the use of power to about 600,000 new people, men, women and children, throughout this province. All of this represents a tremendous achievement compressed into

those few years in that one field alone.

Yesterday, I was interested in a remark made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver), when speaking about Hydro. I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to take this thought home with him, and think of it over the weekend: I will mention two great utilities in this land of ours; one is the Canadian National Railway, operated by an agency run by the government at Ottawa. The other is The Hydro-Electric Power Commission. In regard to the great Canadian National Railway, we notice there has been an increase in freight rates. Since 1940, the freight rates have doubled -- to be absolutely accurate, today the freight rates are 98 percent higher than they were in 1940. Now, let us consider The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, operated by an agency on behalf of the Ontario Government, which has in that time -- since 1940 -- increased its rates by 16¼ percent. I would just ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to consider these figures carefully. Of course, he can say--and it is true -- "the Canadian National Railway needs the rate increases; they have to have them to operate; they have to pay their men more; they have to buy more steel" -- which is also on the up-surge -- "and they have to pay more for other things". But so

does The Hydro-Electric Power Commission. It has to pay its men a larger amount; it has to provide wires; it has to provide towers, and all sorts of things, and yet it has been able to do all that with an increase of 16¼ percent in rates as compared with the 98 percent of the other utility. I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to bear that in mind, and I ask him to be a little more charitable, and not to be so depressed in regard to matters concerning Hydro, when he has that record before him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to turn for a moment to the subject of highways. Since World War II, the Government of Ontario has been endeavouring to overtake the needs for improvements and extentions to our highway system which accumulated, particularly during the early 1940's. This has been made necessary by the spectacular rise in motor vehicle registrations, from 691,000 in 1943 to 1,290,000 at the end of 1952. Last fall, we met in session in this Chamber, and we voted an additional $20 million to a new fund, the Highway Reserve Fund, and I will ask the hon. members shortly to vote another $10 million from this year's funds to this great project of highways, and, Mr. Speaker, I will outline to the hon. members of the House what we propose to do during this coming year. I can assure the hon.

members of this House that this is going to be the greatest development and expansion of any period in the history of our grand old province of Ontario.

Sometimes people say we concentrate on one area or another. Sometimes the people from the northern areas say they are not getting enough; sometimes the people from eastern Ontario say they are not getting enough; sometimes the people from all parts of the province say the same thing. I was interested, Mr. hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in noticing some outstanding examples, such as 100 miles of Red Lake highway opened up in these ten years; the highway extending toward the double-track highway from Highland Creek to Oshawa; then we can jump across the province to the Chapleau-Thessalon highway, then to the controlled-access highway running from Windsor to the Quebec border, and from there we can go down into eastern Ontario, where is located the Trans-Canada highway, in the vicinity of Hawkesbury and extending across this great province. Then we can go and see the double-lane highway at Barrie, and then up to the district of Rainy River and see the Atikokin highway, running into Steep Rock. These are just a few examples of how this program has been spread around. Since 1946,

the Department has carried out 1,440 miles of grading, and 3,900 miles of surfacing with some type of pavement.

Turning to our municipalities which we have helped so greatly during the past few years, may I point out that their assistance has been extended from something less than $4 million -- $3,600,000 -- to nearly $30 million during this past year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I hurry along and turn to lands and building? May I say that despite the things with which we have been faced,

we have provided lands and buildings at many places, including the Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Station at Guelph, the college at Kemptville and elsewhere where extentions have been carried; we have added extentions to the police stations and the communicating systems, the School for the Blind, the teachers' colleges, the fish hatcheries, and the aircraft hangars and the industrial farms and reform institutions, and a number of others.

Perhaps the most outstanding example is the extention to the Ontario Mental Hospitals. May I say that 10 years ago, most of the people from northern Ontario who suffered from mental illnesses, were routed to the hospitals here in the Toronto area.

We have made great strides since that time, and we have at the present time, 6,750 beds in our current program, in some cases practically completed. May I cite the following:

Smith's Falls	-	2,400 beds
Port Arthur	-	1,200 "
Brockville	-	600 "
North Bay	-	1,200 "
Kingston	-	500 "
Toronto	-	100 "
London	-	400 "
Orillia	-	350 "
Total		6,750 "

Mr. Speaker, that is a great record in itself. I would say that in comparison with the times of other governments, it would be ten times the achievements. But may I assure the hon. members that is only part of the over-all picture. In regard to our tubercular sanitoria, we have provided an additional 500 beds in the last three years. The more moderate rate of sanitoria construction is made possible by the low incidence of this disease in Ontario. It is really an outstanding development in medical science and public health administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word in regard to conservation, something about which we have heard a great deal in the past ten years. Conservation

authorities have been extended to nearly one-quarter of the municipalities of Ontario, 256 of them to be exact, including Fanshawe, Conestogo, Luther Marsh and Deloro Dams and Reservoirs; Brampton, Mitchell and St. Mary's Flood Control projects; Long Branch Channel Improvement and Repair of Piers; Ingersoll Channel Improvement; and Port Franks Flood Control. The cost of these totals more than $13 million, and I can say to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that we have on the shelf, awaiting action on the part of the Federal-Provincial-Municipal partnership, plans involving no less than an expenditure of $41 million.

In the same period of time, we have the increases in the provincial assets over that same period, a very remarkable story indeed. In that period of time, we have expended no less than $378 million in capital accounts, and out of that, we have paid $240 out of current revenues, the balance being amortized and provided for by sinking funds.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I digress from what I have in my manuscript, to say that is the reason why Old Ontario's credit is so good and the reason why we can go to Toronto, Montreal, New York and London and secure money, because we have adhered very strictly to a pay-as-you-go policy.

Mr. Speaker, a word about housing: Yesterday, I had the pleasure of meeting with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and others of my colleagues, a deputation from one of the great labour organizations, and it was said there by someone that in Ontario we had a "record in connection with housing to be ashamed of." May I just give you some figures, in that regard?

Since the end of the War, in 1946, in this province, privately and publicly, there have been erected 215,000 new dwelling units, to provide accommodation for one million people. That means that in seven years, the people of the province of Ontario, publicly and privately, have erected enough houses to house one-fifth of the population of this great province.

Last year, in 1952, things looked a little difficult, and perhaps a little black from a housing standpoint. Nevertheless, there were nearly 28,500 houses erected, and it looked as if in 1953 -- this year -- we are going to have the biggest housing program of all. Indeed, as I shall point out in a few minutes, 1954 will be a greater year, and for this reason: by virtue of the improvements in the outmoded municipal system, I feel that this roadblock will be removed, and in 1954 you will see

a great addition to the housing program in Toronto and the suburban area.

I would also like to mention the fact, in summing up, that I believe in the past ten years, we have given to the people of Ontario, good government.

(TAKE B FOLLOWS)

I would not want my friends opposite to shake their heads or to be in doubt about that, I want to just give them a few evidences of it. I think the best government which could be devised in the face of the world war and the Korean war, of the inflationary rise in prices, the scarcity of labour and materials and the rapid growth of our population. Besides the creation of these capital assets, we have maintained a high standard of services in all fields, and at the same time increased our grants to municipalities by more than $100 million. That is an accomplishment unprecedented in the history of this Province. We have had ten consecutive surpluses, and by meeting out of ordinary revenue the greater part of our capital expenditures, we have kept our credit strong.

As I said, we can enter any money market in the world, if need be, because our financial administration has been sound, and our reputation has been untarnished, and thus we are able to proceed with the great capital programs upon which we are now engaged with full confidence and sureness in the result.

I should just like to give you very briefly these few things which have arisen within the last ten years. I want my hon. friends opposite, and particularly those who are beset with doubts, to turn over in their minds, these things which have been brought about in our ten years' administration:

Increases in mothers' allowances and Children's Aid; the Assumption of 50 per cent of the cost of capital construction and maintenance of homes for the

which was agreement,
aged,/never done before. Under Federal-Provincial /
the payment of pensions to everybody over seventy, payable without a means test, and from sixty-five to seventy in cases of need; pensions for disabled persons; improvement in Workmen's Compensation benefits; grants to hospitals which have resulted in the addition of thousands of beds in Ontario; grants to teaching hospitals, and others, and maintenance grants to provide for their assistance to outpatient departments of hospitals; thousands of additional beds in mental hospitals; a seven-fold increase in school grants; the establishment of a stystem of free school books in this province; free milk to school children who are in need; increased grants for our universities; improvement in the welfare of teachers through better super-annuation provision; betterment of reformatory conditions; mining municipalities tax system modernized; tax payments to municipalities on Crown properties and on Hydro properties, the first in any province in Canada; a six-fold increase in grants to the municipalities; the establishment of the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation to help needy municipalities with finances; the implementation of broad housing plans and extending them to the rural areas and to young farmers; to help young people to establish themselves; the expansion of rural power to hundreds of thousands of rural citizens; the provision of rinks and community halls; also recreational centres in many Ontario communities;

the adoption of measures to improve telephone service in rural Ontario; the implementation of The Female Fair Remuneration Act providing for equal pay for equal work, to provide another background in which free enterprise can work and thrive in this great province of ours. Then something which has been very close to me; legislation providing that employment opportunities shall be available to any person irrespective of race, colour, language or creed. I may say that it is always a great pleasure for me to hear the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) speak; he is a new Canadian. Some eighty-six years ago my own people ... were new Canadians coming across the sea to that historic town of Orillia, and I want to say that in this great land of ours one of the things this government has done -- has not only endeavoured to do, but has done -- is to provide the background in our country for the cultures of other peoples and other races who come here, and where these cultures can be recognized, and where the racial individualities can be recognized, and where we can get along together under a common denominator --and the only common denominator -- that we are all Canadians.

We have taken steps to rationalize the tax situation with the Federal Government. We have taken steps to commence the great St. Lawrence seaway. These are just some policies we have put into effect to ensure a healthy environment for the continued progress of our great free enterprise system

in the Province of Ontario.

I should like to make passing reference to the Federal-Provincial situation, and to commend Mr. Abbott on his recent budget, for providing for a tax deduction of 7 per cent instead of 5 per cent applying to our sister province of Quebec.

I would say a year ago we would have been very pleased to have received that ourselves. That has been extended, and I think very properly extended, to our sister province of Quebec, and it is another step on the rational road to good and fair relationships which are required to make our situation work.

We are glad to know that the Federal Government has gone another step further in rationalizing, in the field of security practice. This is one of the minor fields of taxation, and we have no intention of occupying it at the present time, but we will regard it as a reserve field if the need should arise. There are other fields in which I would like to encourage the Federal Government to follow along that rational road. I think the Federal Government should vacate the field of succession duties and I hope that will come about in the course of the next year.

I would like to see them get out of the field of liquor taxes, which I also think is a rational and proper field for the provinces to occupy, and again I say if they would get out of the tobacco field, we

would not only reduce taxes in that field, but we would make wise use of that tax source for extending benefits to the municipalities of this Province of Ontario.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): In other words, they should just get out.

HON. MR. FROST: I never like to put it as abruptly as that, I will leave that for my friend to say.

As regards Federal-Provincial matters,--and I do not want to labour this point. Regarding the tax rental agreements, the present arrangement is a stop-gap arrangement, which is there pending the working out of a better and more rational arrangement.

I quite agree that it does not provide the full measure of our difficulties both provincially and municipally in this Province, however, I am not optimistic enough to say this that everything cannot be corrected at one time, or by a single stroke, and I certainly rejoice that progress is being made, and I think we will see in the course of the coming days great progress along those lines, and I hope progress which will enable the Provinces and the Municipalities to undertake the great work they have at hand.

I should like to turn for a few minutes to this fiscal year, and I might say to the hon. members of this House, we have had, I think, wise, good and economical

administration, I can say to my friend opposite who mentioned the matter of austerity a few days ago, that we have an austerity program ourselves, and that is what enables us to do the great things we do. We try to make every dollar go as far as it will go.

I want this year to recommend to the House by way of supplementary estimates, first, that we give to highways another ten million dollars. I will deal with that in a moment or two.

The second thing I want to recommend to this House is that we give added assistance this year to the hospitals in the Province of Ontario. The hon. members will recollect that last year we provided $5,750,000 for the teaching Hospitals. These grants were designed to enable the great teaching hospitals to rehabilitate their plants and equipment.

Since 1947 we have given large capital grants to our Hospitals across the Province in cases of new construction. This new grant is designed to help the old Hospitals, those old "work horses" that have been pulling the load. Some of them have been there for a great many years and have been doing a great job, and outside of the maintenance grants they have received no assistance. We propose to give to each one of those old Hospitals $400,000 per bed, regardless of whether they are private beds or public beds, and in order that there might be something under the "Christmas Tree" for everybody,

we will give to those Hospitals which have received grants since 1947, an extra $100 a bed. This is designed to help them in the difficulties which they all have.

This is going to cost the Province eight and one half million dollars this year. I would like to give you just one or two examples, but in the budget I have tabled, a copy of which I shall give to the hon. members, we have given a very large number of examples, perhaps 100 or 150 of them, as to how that works out.

The North Bay Civic Hospital, for instance, has built a new hospital since 1947 and received the full Federal and Provincial grants, and under this formula for 104 beds will get a present of $10,400 to help them out to refurbish that new hospital.

Belleville Hospital -- the member for West Hastings is here, I think, and that Hospital is one of the old "work horses" that pulled the load when there were few Hospitals, that Hospital with 130 beds will get $400 a bed, or a total of $50,400 to help them rehabilitate.

In regard to Peterborough. I see my friends from Peterborough have a brand new Hospital, and we will give them $22,600.

We come now to the Salvation Army Grace Hospital of Windsor. They will get $72,400.

My friends will find more examples in the Budget which I will give them. It has many examples of that sort.

As I say, that will cost $8,500,000, and I am going to ask the House to vote that immediately, or at least before the end of this fiscal year.

We are going to give further assistance to our universities. I would like to say that the young men and women going from our universities, into industry and into the professions and into the public services, are one of our great guarantees for the progress and betterment of our Province and our nation, and that has been recognized by both the Federal and Provincial governments. Not only have we increased our grants for maintenance from less than $2,000,000 ten years ago to $6,500,000 for the current year, and I propose in a few minutes to treat the universities better in that regard.

In connection with our universities; we propose to give Queen's University this year a capital grant of $525,000. I think that is more than they asked for, Mr. Speaker.

To the University of Western Ontario, we propose to give $525,000. To McMaster University for the instruction in sciences, $250,000. The University of Ottawa, for their Faculty of Medicine, which is doing a great job, we propose to give $250,000. To Carleton College, $150,000, and for the University of Toronto I might say that we settled with them

before. We provided them with a program which we are increasing in order to take care of some of their shortages. ... We are going to give them the sum of $200,000. Then we are going to give to the Royal Botanical Gardens in Hamilton, $100,000 in connection with that same agreement associated with the McMaster University.

(Take C follows)

Mr. Speaker, in doing this, we are not forgetting our school teachers; we are going to strengthen their superannuation fund by placing an extra million dollars in that fund.

If the House will concur in passing that Supplementary Estimate I might say that with the foregoing grants of $11.5 million, then $30 million which we placed in the reserve fund of the Province -- $20 million, and $10 million in the Supplementary Estimates -- after providing for sinking fund requirements of $17,900,000, we will have an expenditure on ordinary account of $341 million. Our ordinary revenue we estimate to be $341.4 million. That means we will end the year with a surplus of $67,000.

I am very grateful to some hon. members of this House who have not drawn their salaries, and who make it possible for us to add a little increase to that rather slender surplus. In any event, Mr. Speaker, we are ending the year on the right side of the ledger.

I have already tabled the Budget and with it the schedules, so I shall not table the schedules again. These show the particulars of revenues, expenditures, and debts in its various classifications and various summaries.

MR. NIXON: Could the hon. Prime Minister tell us just what is being paid into the sinking fund?

HON. MR. FROST: This year it is $17,900,000. I have not the actual figures here, but it runs about $9.5 million on the retirement of old debt and $8.5 million for the retirement of debt which has been incurred. I told the House a few moments ago that our total capital outlay in the Province in the last ten years ran about $378 million, of which we paid something over $240 million in cash. As regards the balance we have provided sinking funds each year, and that represents the amount to be amortized in the future.

I should now like to turn very briefly to the problemsof health. As we stand here in 1953, there are many new problems and developments ahead. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you might allow me to refer to my manuscript for a page or two, because there are some figures I am sure will be very interesting to hon. members of the House.

We are faced with continuing large scale operations for highways, hydro electric power and the conservation and development of our resources. As I said last March in my Budget Address, "The future productiveness of our industrial structure depends on

how wisely we are able to add to our capital stock. A high rate of investment in production facilities gives better assurance that the problems and tasks of tomorrow will be lighter than those of today."

Many factors will influence our course. Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements and provincial-municipal fiscal arrangements, for instance, are very important. But common to all economic and social activity in the Province is our growing population. It affects virtually all services and explains in part our increased expenditures and, therefore, our need for increased revenues.

Last year Ontario's population increased by 168,000. It may be noted that whereas Canada's population a year ago increased by 3.0 per cent, Ontario's population rose by 3.7 per cent. In the first six months of this year, the number of births in Ontario was 3.6 per cent higher than a year ago. Our population has grown most rapidly at the two ends of the scale, that is, the children of school age, and our more senior citizens, sixty and over. While our total population has increased by 28 per cent since 1941, the number of children fifteen and under has increased by 41 per cent, and the number of persons sixty years and over has risen by 35 per cent. These figures have implications

which cannot be ignored. In education the most pressing problems are caused by the very rapid rise in school enrolments, the impact of which is already felt and is expected to continue for many additional years. Over the next decade, upwards of 50,000 additional pupils must be admitted to the schools each year.

Fifty thousand children like those you see in our galleries will have to go into our schools each year -- next year and the year after. In this developing province we have to build more schools.

Two hundred and fifty new school buildings or substantial additions to existing schools were erected during the past year at a cost of nearly $46 million. New school accommodation was provided for 50,410, but the actual increase in pupil enrolment was 54,000. It will therefore be seen that even this large-scale construction program did not quite meet the demand. In 1953 there will be at least a ten per cent increase in building accommodation.

We must also recruit new teachers. The other day I met some teachers here from the London Normal School. At the present time the enrolment in secondary schools is not so serious because of the

lower birth rate in the early 1940's, but there is nothing more certain than that this situation will change and that very substantial additional high school accommodation will have to be provided.

To provide additional teaching facilities two new Teachers' Colleges will be erected without delay, one in Toronto to replace the present Normal School, which this year was forced to operate on double shifts, and the other to replace the Normal School in Hamilton, which was destroyed by fire. That is what it means, translated into the people's dollars.

The importance of higher education and continued study by adult citizens is reflected in the appropriations for grants for the maintenance of the universities in the coming fiscal year. As I have pointed out, maintenance grants to the universities in the present year totalled $6,502,000. Next year they will amount to $6,955,000, an increase of $453,000. All told, the Provincial Government's bill for education in the year 1953-54 will amount to $78,004,000, including grants of $58,380,000 to school boards and an additional $1,035,000 to libraries and community centres.

It is only a few days since I mentioned that in the campaign of 1943 reference was made to the fact

that the cost of education in the Province was $16 million. Next year the cost of education is going to be over $78 million. The comparable figures are those of ten years ago, and the grants for schools then were $8,500,000; this year they are going to be $58,380,000. That is only one section only of the picture which confronts us today, in 1953.

At this time I should like to turn to highways. I mentioned a moment ago about the tremendous increase in motor vehicle registration. Some time ago I stated that we have enough automobile registrations in this Province now so that everyone in the Province -- man, woman and child -- could get into an automobile at the same time and there would never be more than four in each car, and certainly they would not be crowded, and they could all be on wheels at the same time if you could provide for a whistle to be blown and everyone step into a car. That is true, and is an indication of the problem we have in this Province in respect of highways.

With that, of course, we have some six and a half million American motor cars coming into this Province annually, with upwards of seventeen to eighteen million persons added to

our population of nearly five million, and with that we have increased expenditures, traffic hazards and traffic tie-ups, and we have people strap-hanging and standing for hours waiting on the roads.

We have had "sunshine budgets;" I heard that the year I was first elected, and I always say that all my budgets have been "sunshine budgets." But, if a name is required for this budget, it will be a great construction and developmental budget, which is gauged and keyed up to the times and the requirements of the days in which we live.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we are asking hon. members of the Legislaure to give us authority to spend on highways this year no less than the unprecedented sum of $153 million. Due to wise financing, we plan to pay $111 million of that in cash and carry the balance forward to be amortized and paid over a period of years.

I am going to ask the House, in addition to the highway reserve account of $30 million, to vote $58 million for maintenance; another $23 million next year to the highway reserve fund, and $41 million for highway capital and $1 million for capital in connection with mining roads, making a total of $153 million.

Of this $153 million, $95 million will be for capital construction, and I know I will please the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) by saying that the majority of that capital construction is paid in cash.

I would not care to try to enumerate to the hon. members of this House how such a vast sum will be spent, but perhaps I can bring it down into totals to show you that the Province will be covered. In Southwestern Ontario, in the extreme southwest, we plan to spend $11,362,000, which includes the extension of the Windsor-Chatham highway, and the same highway in the London-Woodstock area and the London by-pass.

In the Central Southern Ontario divisions, including the Toronto-Hamilton area and north to beyond Lake Simcoe, we plan to spend $19,630,000, which includes such items as the Toronto by-pass; the Orillia by-pass; the Barrie by-pass; the divided highway east of Oshawa; the new highway from Pontypool to Peterboro; Highway 69 Washago-Brechin, Newcastle-Orono; Queen Elizabeth Highway near Oakville; Freeman to Wolfe Island and approaches to Burlington Bridge.

In the Southeastern Ontario division we include Kingston, Ottawa, Pembroke, Bancroft and

all that district, for $9,520,000. This will include such things as the extension of the No. 2 Highway, running through that country at various points, and the by-passes and improvements to that highway, including the Kingston by-pass. Then, especially for the hon. member for Renfrew North, our share of the Alumette Island Bridge is also included. This should please the people of Pembroke. We have the Trans-Canada Highway, stretching from the extreme easterly part of Ontario around Hawkesbury through Ottawa, and around the district of New Ferry to Adolphustown.

In the North Central and Northeastern Ontario divisions we include Huntsville and all that section of Northern Ontario, and allotted $19,891,000. T his includes the North Bay by-pass; the Trans-Canada Highway in Huntsville and Sudbury areas; the Trans-Canada and other roads through and in the White River area, Michipicoten and over to the lakehead. I think I am quoting the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr.Doucett) rightly that in the Michipicoten area alone, in both directions from Michipicoten, on the Trans-Canada Highway system, something like $5 million will be spent. I believe the Trans-Canada Highway will be completed in time to cover the entire contract with the Federal

Government. There is something here also for the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons) -- the Montreal River road.

In the Northwestern Ontario divisions, that is, Fort William and Kenora, we will spend $9,863,000. For property, buildings, bridges, surveys and so on, $5 million. There is also in the Estimates the sum of $2 million to provide for taking care of level crossings over railway tracks; this is something new in Ontario budgets. That is a three-way partnership, and I believe the hon. Minister of Highways told me that sum of money would represent $6 million when multiplied by the grant from the Railways and the Federal Government.

As I said before, $1 million for mining roads is also included.

For our municipalities, a capital sum of $16.5 million, and for maintenance a further sum of $16,700,000 is included. For re-surfacing highways, which is a new item, there is an amount of $3 million. All that adds up to the huge sum I have given you of $153 million, which is unprecedented in the history of this Province.

Now we turn to public buildings. At the present time we have under way in this Province public buildings to the amount of $65 million.

Part of the cost was financed last year and part of it will be paid for this coming year, and we are providing the sum of $22 million in next year's Estimates for furthering this work. Here again, I shall only give you some of the highlights. First, the new Osgoode Hall Annex, at a cost of $2.5 million, and the completion of the Compensation Board Building for $2,900,000. Then there is the Reformatory at Millbrook, $2.5 million; the completion of the hospital at Smith's Falls, Kingston and Brockville, involving an expenditure of some $13 million. We have the Ontario Hospital at Toronto, where it is planned to spend $2.5 million; at London, $2,800,000; at North Bay, $9 million; at Port Arthur, around $7,500,000; at Orillia, $2,680,000. At Guelph we have such things as the bettering of the buildings at the Ontario Agricultural College, amounting to roughly $600,000. At Kemptville we are spending $400,000 for the buildings there, and $3,605,000 to better the services of the farmers in the great food centre here on the Queen Elizabeth Way.

In connection with Highway buildings, some $3 million will be expended. New teachers' colleges at Toronto will account for $2,200,000; Hamilton, $1 million.

Mr. Speaker, that is just a part of the

expansion program of this Government.

I shall hurry along and just give you the figure for conservation, which is something new in any Budget since 1943. The total for conservation will be $16,400,000.

To expand service to the rural people of this Province, $9,700,000 is included to provide for another twenty-five thousand customers for Hydro in this Province, which will supply power to about one hundred thousand more people.

We have in this Budget provisions for community halls, recreation centres and things of that sort.

Mr. Speaker, if I might take this sentence from my manuscript, let us remember that our great rural background is the sheet anchor in our economy. The benefits in this Budget for schools, rinks, playgrounds, roads, rural hydro, hospitals, and a host of other things, are all calculated to strengthen and improve the rural way of life.

In connection with housing, may I say that since I have told you of the progress in the last year, We estimate that next year is going to be the best year we ever have had in the history of this Province; that is the year 1953-1954, and we are hopeful when the Metropolitan Council gets down to business in 1954 we will show further great improvement.

(D-1 follows)

We are placing in the Budget this year $10 million for housing, which, of course, is our proportion of the 25/75 Federal deal, which really involves an expenditure on public housing of about $40 million. May I say to the hon. members of this House that in the Budget there are many items in connection with housing, and the hon. members can look up the details for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word about taxes. I know the hon. members in this House will realize that with such a Budget as this, Old Man Ontario is going to require a few more resources to pay these bills. May I say to the hon. members at once, there will be no new taxes. Furthermore, there will be no increase in the rates of the present taxes, and there will be a few tax reductions.

First of all, the principal tax reduction; may I say that we have given to the corporations of this province a reduction of 2 percent across the board, and relieved them from their place of business tax. I will say nothing further on that at the moment. In ordinary cases, that would be a major statement in itself. But we intend to do this; we will make it unnecessary for the corporations to file forms, which will relieve them of staff requirements, with which they are presently burdened.

Secondly, we intend to allow corporations to deduct from the payments due us, the special provisions they have made for pension funds in respect to the past services of their employees. This will be of assistance to the pension funds as well as to the corporations, and will bring our methods into line with the Federal methods.

The next thing is we are making provision to relieve widows and children, and preferred classes of beneficiaries of any payment at all which may be impinged upon the first $50,000 of the estate. I may say that suggestion came from the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roberts) who advocated it last year, and it is in the Budget this year, so the first $50,000 of the estate will be completely unimpaired to all beneficiaries.

In regard to the racetrack tax; last year it was on a graded basis, from 8 percent to 12 percent. This year, it will be on a straight 8 percent. basis.

The next is in connection with the Greater Toronto and York Bill; the unconditional subsidies will become due on the 1st of January, 1954, to the municipalities. I mentioned before we planned to abolish the mortgage tax, which would apply to Toronto, the County of York and the City of Hamilton.

I propose to abolish that as of April 1st, and to compensate the municipalities in the meantime, for their loss of revenue in connection with that, which we estimate to be probably $300,000. This means it is of assistance to the little men of this community, and an assistance to housing. That ancient tax was imposed back in the days when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was a member of the government of a different colour, back, I think, in 1920. The tax at that time was imposed to enable the City of Toronto and the County of York to build a registry office, and it has persisted ever since. That will be stricken off.

In connection with the coming year, we estimate revenues at $334 million; we are providing $14½ million in sinking funds, and we estimate a modest surplus of $185,000 for next year. Again, I refer the hon. members to the schedules which have already been tabled, showing the particulars.

Mr. Speaker, I am nearing the conclusion of my address, and I think I have done fairly well to cover all this ground in such a comparatively short time. May I say that I go to church on Sundays, and sometimes when the preacher speaks more than twenty minutes, some of these attending will look at their watches. I would say for myself,

that I do not, but on these occasions I wonder what the poor hon. members of the House think when they are beset with a speech on an occasion like this which lasts for something over an hour, and I ask the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to have mercy on us in connection with these four-hour speeches we sometimes have. But I would like to give the hon. members of the House, a summary of the year 1952-1953, and a summary of the year 1953-1954.

Some people may say this is an election Budget. Such is not the case at all. It is a normal Budget with us. When we went to the country in the fall of 1951, we made one or two very minor promises. I made no promises to the people of Ontario, nor did my followers and supporters, except to give the people this promise, that we would give them good government; that is all. And this Budget is in accordance with that promise. This is just an ordinary Budget, calculated to give the people of Ontario good government.

We have a surplus, after providing for sinking funds, in the amount of $17,800,000, and allowing $30 million for the highway reserve account, of $67,000. and I am very proud of that surplus. This is the Government's tenth consecutive Budget

since 1943, and we are providing $8½ million for the rehabilitation of old hospitals and assisting the new ones.

For hospitals this year -- that is, the year in which we are now, up until the end of this month -- we are providing $22,350,000 for hospitals, for maintenance more than $9 million, and $4½ million for construction, and this special grant of $8½ million.

To the universities as I have said, we gave the amount of which I spoke a little while ago, and a contribution to the teachers' superannuation fund, and a grant of $100,000 to the Royal Botannical Gardens, and $30 million to the Reserve Account of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett).

This year, we have spent $127 million on highways, which up to this time, is an all-time record.

Through the Ontario-Municipal Improvement Corporation, we have purchased over $5 million of municipal bonds, and the tax rental agreement we made this year with Ottawa will produce about $123 million, and we have provided tax reductions for all the corporations in Ontario. We have been able to go to New York and borrow $50 million, and another $150 million from our people, which will

show the hon. members that our credit is very good at the present time.

We have paid for the province's share of rural Hydro an amount of $9,800,000.

Turning now to the year 1953-1954, which begins on April 1st, we plan another Budget in which we will put every dollar we can get into a Capital Construction program for this province. We are going to pay off $14½ million, and at the end of that time we estimate we will have $185,000 as a surplus. Of course, if we have more, we will use it for some useful purpose, such as highway reserve fund, and things of that sort. As the hon. members will see, I am forecasting this Government's eleventh consecutive surplus since it came into office.

We plan a campaign to abolish the level railway crossings in this province, and we are putting $2 million for that purpose. We plan to overtake the twenty-year backlog of deferred highway construction and maintenance, and we will ask the House to permit us to embark on a program of $153 million this year.

We are placing another $10 million in the Estimates for housing, which will make another $20 million item, which we hope to completely use this year.

We will give a grant to the municipalities of $4,700,000 next year, excluding, of course, the special grant to hospitals. We are planning on the 1st of January, 1954, to engage, for the first time in the history of this province -- or indeed any province of Canada -- in the new unconditional grant which will involve an expenditure of some $12 million. For education, we are providing $78½ million, an increase of more than $6 million over last year.

For our universities, we are increasing their grants for maintenance as follows: For the Toronto University, we are increasing from $3,700,000 to $4,700,000; the Ontario College of Education, from $420,000 to $470,000; for Queen's University, for maintenance, from $550,000 to $625,000; the University of Western Ontario, a similar amount from $550,000 to $625,000. These amounts have nothing to do with the capital grants which I mentioned a moment ago.

In regard to McMaster University, we are increasing by $50,000, up to $200,000. For the Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, we are giving a like increase; for Carlton College, we are increasing for maintenance purpose by $35,000, legislative grants for elementary and secondary

schools, amounts to $58 million, an increase of $4 million over last year, and in health and the development of human resources, we are increasing by an amount of $3 million, making the total for health this year, $46½ million, and for welfare, over $26 million.

We are making provision for the maintenance of Ontario mental hospitals to an extent of $18½ million, an increase of over $2 million. We are providing $22 million for public works, and $16½ million for conservation, $9,600,000 for rural extentions, nearly $9 million for the Department of Agriculture, and providing $300,000 to complete the standardization of hose couplings and fire fighting equipment for the municipalities, almost entirely at our own costs.

Then there are the reductions in connection with corporation employees' pension fund, succession duties, racetrack taxes, mortgage taxes, and there will be no new taxes, and no increase in the rate of present taxation.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is an ordinary Budget. When we bring in an extraordinary one, we will tell you all about it. This is simply along the line of giving good government to the people of this province.

This year, Mr. Speaker, rounds out ten years of my stewardship as Treasurer of the province of Ontario -- and I think the members of this honourable body will agree with me when I assert with unaffected sincerity that Ontario's progress during the past ten years constitutes a record of achievement unsurpassed by any comparable public authority anywhere on this continent. This impressive record -- for it is most impressive -- has been possible of accomplishment, in large measure, because of our great heritage.

We are debtors for this heritage that has made possible all we are and have to-day: the sustaining faith of those pioneers who laid the foundations of our provincial institutions; the breadth of vision of the Fathers of Confederation who established our Canada as a nation; the freedoms that are ours, freedom to worship as we will, to speak the things that we believe, to attempt new methods of production, to venture into fields of endeavour that make for increased human enjoyment and for the betterment of all, spiritually as well as materially. This heritage commands our eternal gratitude and inspires within us a realization of our own obligations to the future. In this spirit, entering as we are upon another year of opportunity,

we dedicate ourselves to the task of making 1953-1954 a notable year of progress, a year outstripping the achievements of the best of our former years. That this is possible, we firmly believe, and this we shall strive to attain, relying as we shall upon the support of all hon. members of this Assembly, and, indeed, of all the people of this Grand Old Province of Ontario.

MR. H. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

BUDGET STATEMENT

of the

HONOURABLE LESLIE M. FROST
Treasurer of the Province of Ontario

in the

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO
THURSDAY, MARCH 12th, 1953.

HONOURABLE LESLIE M. FROST (Treasurer of Ontario) moved:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to come before the House and present again an account of so many new records of growth, progress and accomplishment. Our policy throughout the year has continued to be one of maintaining an economic environment friendly to industrial expansion, to the creation of new employment opportunities and the steady advance of better living, not for the privileged or any special segment of our people, but for all. Ontario's provincial product - the end value of all goods and services - increased during the past year by over seven per cent in value and six per cent in physical volume, equalling the increase of last year, which was well above the long term average. This continues a series of advances which has seen our total provincial production nearly doubled in value in the decade that this Government has been in office. Our population growth - composed of a high natural increase combined with more than 50 per cent of the immigrants coming to Canada - is three to four times what it was a decade ago. By this time next year we shall have crossed the five million mark in population.

Of the ten years, 1943 - 1953, that this Government has been in power, none could really be called normal. In the early years that we were in office, the nation was engaged in an all-out war. It was unthinkable and, indeed, impossible in those years for us to undertake any capital expansion which would not make an immediate contribution to winning the War. In consequence of this deferment of government undertakings, the accumulation of need for those services, including housing, which arises from the normal growth in population, gradually snowballed into formidable dimensions.

Actually this accumulated backlog of need goes back to the 1930's. During most of that decade the rate of construction was below requirements. It is hoped that we have learned from that experience. The fact is that many of the problems of expanding public services which we now face are really problems of long standing. They had their origin twenty years ago when the construction of public undertakings was less than the requirements attendant on normal population growth.

Even after World War II, shortages of labour and materials, such as steel and cement, hampered public construction. There were just not enough men and materials to do all the things that people wanted to have done at once. New factories were being built and equipped; houses were required in great numbers, the soaring demand for electric power outran the capacity of hydro plants to generate it. All these developments combined to produce a rapidly expanding economy with strong, competing demands for labour and materials. We gave priority to hydro, private industry and housing. It was the sound thing to do. We maintained close cooperation with all governments to avoid competing for scarce resources, which would have served only to aggravate inflationary pressures. That has been our policy throughout -- to work in the provincial and national interest for price stability and for a prosperous, fully employed economy. In this way we have facilitated the expansion of our industrial capacity which has, in turn, contributed to the rising living standards for our people. In our ten years of office, despite war, high costs and scarcity of labour and materials, we have managed nevertheless, without in any way endangering national objectives or straining our finances, to carry out a comprehensive program of essential works and services.

Ontario Hydro

One of the basic keys to the economic expansion in this Province is Ontario Hydro. The remarkable increase in the supply of low cost electric power in the last eight years underlies the expansion of our modern industrial capacity, the electrification of our farms and the continued pro-

gress in providing labour saving appliances in the home. During the past eight years, Ontario Hydro has experienced its greatest expansion since its inception forty-seven years ago. It had taken thirty-seven years for Hydro to increase its own generating capacity to a little over 1½ million h.p.; in the last ten years it has added 2 million h.p., an increase of 128 per cent. Yet, in spite of the increase in generating capacity, there is no surplus of power today.

Exceptional progress has been made in providing rural power extension to farmers and other rural dwellers. Supported by the grants of the Province, the number of miles of primary line serving rural power customers has been doubled, while the number of these customers has increased 1½ times from 136,164 in December, 1943 to 343,537 in December, 1952. Nearly 25,000 new rural customers have been supplied with hydro-electric power in the past year. All this represents a tremendous achievement compressed into a few years.

Highways

Since World War II, the Government of Ontario has been endeavouring to overtake the needs for improvements and extensions to our highway system which accumulated particularly during the early 1940's. This has been made necessary by the spectacular rise in motor vehicle registrations from 691,615 in 1943 to 1,290,000 at the end of December, 1952. Thus, in the decade, motor vehicle registrations have nearly doubled. At last October's Session of the Legislature, we supplemented the appropriation for highways by creating a highway reserve account into which $20 million was placed to provide for a number of special projects. We are proposing out of our revenues for the current year to provide an additional $10 million to be paid into the highway reserve fund, which will make available out of this year's revenue $30 million for special highway improvements.

Looking back over the past ten years, it is easy to select a score of highway projects which have made notable contributions to the development of this Province. For example, the 100 mile Red Lake Highway, which

opened up a large mining area to motor vehicle traffic, the controlled-access highway from Highland Creek to Oshawa, the Chapleau-Thessalon highway, opening the Chapleau area to motor vehicles, and the Trans-Canada Highway resulting from the 1950 agreement. Then we have the controlled-access highway being constructed across the southern part of the Province from Windsor to the Quebec border, and the sixty mile long controlled-access highway from Toronto to Barrie which has been placed in service. Now, we have under way a seventy-five mile section of highway leading into the rich iron ore mining territory of Atikokan and Steep Rock Lake. Since 1946, the Department has carried out 1,440 miles of grading and 3,900 miles of surfacing with some type of pavement, varying from concrete to light bituminous, and constructed more than 400 bridges.

I have remarked on other occasions how, not so many years ago, provincial highways were financed in large part by the municipalities. In the municipal field, when we came into office, Provincial contributions to municipalities for county and township road systems amounted to only $3.6 million. This year, we will pay to all municipalities grants for roads totalling $29.3 million. We have brought cities, towns and villages into a comprehensive road subsidy system.

In 1948, we also established the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund -- a milestone in Ontario's highway history not to be forgotten.

Lands and Buildings

In reviewing these years of progress, we must mention briefly the increasing investment in public buildings and works made necessary by the economic expansion of this Province. Extensive additions have been made to the Ontario agricultural colleges and experimental stations at Guelph, Kemptville and elsewhere, and to a variety of other projects, including police stations and communication systems, schools for the blind, teachers' colleges, fish hatcheries, aircraft hangars, industrial farms and reform institutions, and many others.

The major part of this investment has, however, been devoted to the expansion of Ontario's mental hospitals. In planning these hospitals, consideration has been given to providing accommodation in different localities so that the residents in northern or eastern parts of the Province are not obliged to travel long distances to visit relatives who may be undergoing treatment at one of these hospitals. Thus, the northern part of the Province is served by new institutions at Port Arthur and North Bay, the eastern sections by the new institutions at Smith's Falls, Brockville and Kingston, and the more central areas by additions at Toronto, London, Orillia and Aurora. New units, such as those at Aurora, Orillia and Smith's Falls, have already been placed in service; and in the coming fiscal year 740 beds will be available at Port Arthur, an additional 900 at Smith's Falls and 600 at Brockville -- a total of 2,240 becoming available in 1953-54. This is but part of the Government's current program which will add 6,750 beds as follows:

Smith's Falls	2,400 beds
Port Arthur	1,200 "
Brockville	600 "
North Bay	1,200 "
Kingston	500 "
Toronto	100 "
London	400 "
Orillia	350 "
Total	6,750 "

In the case of sanatoria for tubercular cases, 500 beds have been built in the last three years. The more moderate rate of sanatoria construction is made possible by the low incidence of this disease in Ontario. It is really an outstanding development in medical science and public health administration.

Conservation

In 1946, we entered the conservation field in a big way. Conservation authorities embracing 256 municipalities were established. Among the projects are the Fanshawe, Conestogo, Luther Marsh and Deloro Dams and Reservoirs; Brampton, Mitchell and St. Mary's Flood Control

projects; Long Branch Channel Improvement and Repair of Piers; Ingersoll Channel Improvement; and Port Franks Flood Control. The cost of these flood control projects now totals more than $13 million. The Province pays 75 per cent of the cost of all surveys. The Federal Government now comes into the project to the extent of 37½ per cent.

Seven of the authorities have made agreements with the Department of Lands and Forests for nursery stock. It has not been possible to do everything that is desired at once, but a great deal of work has been done and additional plans are projected for the future. At the present time a shelf of plans has been prepared for flood and conservation control projects involving an expenditure of $41 million.

Increase in Province's Physical Assets

In the last ten years, we have increased our physical assets, including highways, buildings, conservation projects and rural power extensions, by $378.5 million, while we have financed $240.7 million, or 64 per cent, of that investment out of current revenues. That means we have drawn less than $138 million net out of the money market, and therefore have not encumbered it at a time when the need for borrowed funds for housing and industrial expansion was very large. The figures are as follows:

Province's Investment in Physical Assets

	1952-53 $	Ten Year Total 1943-44 - 1952-53 $
Highways	68,685,000	268,305,629
Provincial Lands and Buildings	11,724,000	45,517,974
Rural Power Lines	9,800,000	55,386,112
Miscellaneous Projects	6,497,825	9,325,904
Total	96,706,825	378,535,619

In other words we have in a ten-year period invested over $378 million in permanent capital works and we have paid in cash over $241 million. The additions to our physical capital on a yearly basis have averaged $37.8 million. We have paid $24.1 million of that amount out of revenue and capitalized only $13.7 million. That is a great record.

Housing

More than 215,000 dwelling units have been built in Ontario since the end of World War II, providing accommodation for nearly one million people and establishing a rate of construction exceeding that of any other period of corresponding length.

During the past year, the number of dwelling units completed in Canada was lower than that in the two previous years and, although it was also lower in this Province, the rise in housing starts in the late months of the year presented a brighter picture here than in any other province, except Newfoundland.

In 1952, 28,446 dwelling units were completed in Ontario as against 32,705 in the previous year. In the first few months, conditions were not too favourable for construction, but later with the greater availability of funds, construction picked up rapidly and 1953 should be a good year in housing construction.

Repayments under the Government's Second Mortgage plan showed further improvement and as at the end of February, 1953, 2,376 loans had been fully repaid.

In my Budget Address last year, I dealt fully with the various plans which have been developed in co-operation with the Federal Government for assistance to low cost housing. In June, 1951, we started a pilot plan to build 5,000 low-cost units, with provision for expanding it up to 25,000 units. The plan was designed as a very useful auxiliary to make housing accommodation available to that segment of our population unable to accumulate a large enough equity to meet down payments for houses under the normal N.H.A., or private mortgage loans. This is the

first time a government of this Province has undertaken to provide housing at a cost lower than that required to recover the full amount of the loan. Substantial progress has been made, but unfortunately the plan would not operate in the Toronto area. With the new Metropolitan system, the road blocks will be removed and we should witness great progress in this area.

Grants to Municipalities and Other Agencies for Capital Purposes

In addition to the direct capital investment of the Province, we are making available for capital purposes each year a large part of our total grants to municipalities, school and hospital boards and other agencies. In the last ten years, our grants have increased from $18 million to $124.9 million, and more than one third of that $124.9 million has been for new roads, buildings, and equipment. About 40 per cent of our Provincial revenues go to the municipalities. Next year with the great reform of unconditional grants, this will increase. No provincial budget in Canada, nor indeed in America, is slanted towards municipal assistance to such a large extent as ours.

We believe that, in the past ten years, we have given to the people of Ontario good government, the best government which could be devised in the face of the World War, the Korean War, the inflationary rise in prices, the scarcity of labour and materials and the rapid growth of our population. Besides the creation of these capital assets, we have maintained a high standard of services in all fields, and at the same time increased our grants to municipalities by more than $100 million. That is an accomplishment unprecedented in the history of this Province. We have had ten consecutive surpluses, and by meeting out of ordinary revenue the greater part of our capital expenditures on highways and other capital assets, we have kept our credit strong. We can enter any money market in the world, if need be, for our financial administration has been sound and our reputation untarnished,

and thus we are able to proceed with the great capital programs upon which we are now engaged with full confidence in the result.

Over a ten-year period we have recorded many outstanding achievements. Among them are the following:

Increases in mothers' allowances and Children's Aid;

Assumption of 50 per cent of the cost of capital construction and maintenance of homes for the aged;

Under Federal agreement, the payment of old age pensions - payable without a means test to persons seventy and over and for the needy from sixty-five to seventy;

Payment of pensions to disabled persons who are in need between the ages of 21 and 65;

Improvement in Workmen's Compensation Benefits;

Addition of thousands of beds in hospitals through capital grants;

Grants to teaching hospitals for modernization; maintenance grants to hospitals; assistance to outpatient departments of hospitals; grants to isolation hospitals;

Thousands of additional beds in Mental Hospitals;

Seven-fold increase in school grants;

Establishment of a system of "free" school books for pupils up to and including Grade X;

"Free" milk to school children in need;

Greatly increased grants to universities;

Improvement in the welfare of teachers provided through larger provincial contributions to their Superannuation Funds, and increased pensions to retired teachers;

Betterment of Reformatory conditions;

Mining municipalities tax system modernized;

Tax payments to municipalities on Ontario Crown properties and Ontario Hydro business properties;

Six-fold increase in grants in aid to municipalities;

Establishment of the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation for the purpose of making loans available to municipalities for water and sewage works;

Implementation of broad housing plans to encourage and assist construction of new houses, both in cities and rural areas;

Provision of loans to assist young farmers to establish themselves on farms of their own;

Extension of rural power to hundreds of thousands of rural citizens;

Provision of rinks, community halls and recreational centres in many Ontario communities;

Adoption of measures to improve the telephone service in rural Ontario;

Implementation of The Female Fair Remuneration Act providing for equal pay for equal work irrespective of sex;

Legislation providing that employment opportunities shall be available to any person irrespective of race, language or creed;

Substantial steps taken to rationalize Federal-Provincial tax relations.

These are just some of the policies we have put into effect to assure a healthy environment for the continued progress of our free enterprise system.

Federal-Provincial Relations

A notable event of this year was the signing on October 29th of an agreement between this Government and the Government of Canada, providing for the rental of the Province's rights to the individual income tax, corporation income tax and special corporation taxes for the period of five years from January 1st, 1952.

I should like to comment favourably on two significant changes affecting Federal-Provincial fiscal relations which were announced

by the Hon. Douglas C. Abbott in his Budget Address of last February 19. The first is that Mr. Abbott increased from 5 per cent to 7 per cent the tax credit allowed to corporations for payment of corporation tax to provincial governments. While this does not benefit Ontario at the moment, it will be of immeasurable help to our sister Province of Quebec, for it means that their corporations will be entitled to deduct the full 7 per cent income tax imposed by that Province instead of, as formerly, only 5 per cent. It is another step on the road to rational relationships and is eminently fair. We were also gratified to know that the Federal Government has repealed its security transfer tax. This is one of the minor fields of taxation which Ontario has long maintained should be left to the provinces. We have no intention of increasing our security transfer tax rate at the present time, but we will regard it as a reserve field, where, if the need should arise, the Province may step in.

We should like to see the Federal Government's action in repealing the security transfer tax broadened to include the entire fields of succession duties, liquor and cigarette taxes. Admittedly, the provinces and the municipalities require additional revenues and there is probably no other field in which more good would come than from having a single tax authority in the liquor tax field. The Provincial Government has to deal with the immensely complex problems arising from the liquor business, such as law enforcement and control and the direction of sales, with all their myriad complications. We sincerely hope that the Federal Government will progressively withdraw from these three fields, leaving them exclusively to the provinces.

As in all fields of mutual interest and concern, we are cooperating closely with the Federal Government on fiscal matters. Nevertheless, we must recognize that, although the present tax rental agreement is a great improvement over the 1947 agreements, it is at best a stop-gap arrangement, pending the working out of a more satisfactory distribution of tax and revenue sources. It does not provide a solution to the municipal

problem, which is dependent upon a significant shift in revenue and taxes from the Federal Government to the provinces. However, we are making progress. Everything cannot be corrected at a single stroke, and I rejoice that progress is being made.

Special Grants and Payments to Hospitals

Last year the Government paid out special capital grants of $5,750,000 to teaching hospitals. These grants were designed to enable the hospitals to enlarge their facilities and acquire modern equipment. This year we propose to provide all public general hospitals with additional grants which they may use to renovate any obsolete facilities and equipment. The grant will be distributed to hospitals on a proportionate basis calculated on the number of beds in each hospital: $400 will be paid for each bed which is currently in use and for which a capital grant has not been paid since April 1, 1947; and $100 will be paid for each bed for which a grant has been paid or approved since April 1, 1947. These grants are intentionally designed to help the older hospitals which have received little capital help. We cannot let them fall into neglect. They are in the greatest need of capital repairs and major renovations and they will obtain the greater part of the assistance, but we are also recognizing the requirements of newer hospital units and they will receive a grant of $100 with respect to each bed. Perhaps I should give a few examples showing how the grant will work out:

> The North Bay Civic Hospital has built a new hospital since 1947 and received capital grants from the Government on 104 beds. Under this formula, it will now receive a further $10,400.
>
> The Belleville Hospital, which has the same structure now as in 1947, will receive on its 126 beds, $50,400.
>
> In Peterborough, the Peterborough Civic Hospital abandoned its old building, erected a new hospital, and received capital grants from the Province on 226 beds. It will now receive $22,600.
>
> At Windsor, the Salvation Army Grace Hospital is still operating in the same unit it had in 1947. Assistance for improving its facilities will be paid, amounting to $400 on each of its 181 beds, a total of $72,400.

policies, which in themselves represent a significant shift in revenue and taxes from the Federal Government to the provinces. However, we are making progress. Everything cannot be corrected at a single stroke, and I believe that progress is being made.

<u>Special Grants and Payments to Hospitals</u>

Last year the government paid out special capital grants of $3,970,000 to provincial hospitals. These grants were designed to assist the hospitals to enlarge their facilities and acquire modern equipment. This year we propose to provide all public general hospitals with such capital grants which they may use to renovate and modernize facilities and equipment. The grant will be distributed to hospitals on a proportionate basis calculated on the number of beds in each hospital. $100 will be paid for each bed which is [illegible] to the use and for which a capital grant has not been paid since April 1, 1957 and $200 will be paid for each bed for which a grant has been paid or approved since April 1, 1957. These grants are intentionally designed to help the older hospitals which have received little capital help. We cannot let them [illegible]. They are in the greatest need of capital repairs and major renovation and they will receive the greater part of the assistance. I am also recognizing the requirements of newer hospitals [illegible] make a grant of [illegible] in respect to each [illegible]. The following examples show how the grants will work out:

> The Saint John General Hospital [illegible] which last year received capital grants [illegible] beds in new wing [illegible] receive a further $107,400.
>
> The [illegible] hospital, which [illegible] in 1957, will receive [illegible]
>
> In Fredericton, the Victoria Public Hospital, [illegible] and received capital grants [illegible]. It will now [illegible]
>
> At [illegible], the [illegible] hospital [illegible] in the year [illegible] 1957 [illegible]

It is intended that these grants be used for the rehabilitation of buildings and the acquisition of more efficient machinery and equipment in order to reduce the cost of hospital maintenance and operation. We do not, however, propose to tie the hands of the hospital boards, and they will be allowed as wide a latitude as possible. The total amount being provided for this purpose is $8,500,000. A detailed schedule showing how the grants will work out is included in the Appendix. Again I say it has been designed to help the older hospitals and portions of hospitals which have not received help. These grants will be paid at once.

Special Capital Grants to Universities

The universities of Ontario occupy an important place in the social and economic life of this Province. The young men and women going out from our universities into industry, the professions and public service will help assure the continued progress and betterment of the Provino and the nation. Not only have we increased our grants for their maintenance from less than $2 million ten years ago to $6,502,000 in the current year but we have also given, from time to time, special grants for capital purposes. The provincial university - the University of Toronto - has received special consideration of this kind, as have indeed all the other universities. Last year we made a special allotment of capital grants to the universities of $2,300,000.

The universities are centres of culture and inspiration, but, besides this role, their work in the fields of engineering, medicine and the social sciences calls for our continued interest. During the current year we are providing maintenance grants totalling $6,502,000 . In addition, we propose again to pay to the universities special capital grants much the same as we did last year. We will also pay a special grant of $100,000 to the Royal Botanical Gardens, the work of which is related. These new capital grants, totalling $2 million, are allotted

as follows:

Queen's University	$ 525,000
University of Western Ontario	525,000
McMaster University - for instruction in the sciences	250,000
University of Ottawa - for the Faculty of Medicine	250,000
Carleton College	150,000
University of Toronto	200,000
Total Universities	$1,900,000
Royal Botanical Gardens	100,000
Total	$2,000,000

These grants will be paid at once out of this year's revenue.

Special Grant for Teachers' Superannuation

We are also providing a special grant of $1 million for Teachers' Superannuation.

Supplementary estimates will be introduced to give effect to these special grants.

Expenditure and Revenue

Including the foregoing special grants and payments of $11.5 million and the payment of $30.0 million into the Highway Reserve Fund, the net ordinary expenditure, before provision for sinking funds, is estimated at $323.5 million in the present year, 1952-53. Provision for sinking funds is $17.9 million, made up of $9.4 million required to retire the old debt and the amount of $8.5 million applied to capital indebtedness incurred during the year. Together with the expenditures on services and debt interest, these make a total net ordinary expenditure this year of $341.4 million.

Reflecting the continued high level of economic activity in the Province, the net ordinary revenue for 1952-53 is estimated at $341.4 million. The largest single item is, of course, the revenue received under the tax rental agreement. Our receipts from this source in the present fiscal year will amount to $123.3 million. The estimated

revenue from the gasoline tax is $76.8 million; Liquor Control Board profits, $42.0 million; and motor vehicle licences, $22.2 million.

After providing for sinking funds, we are anticipating a surplus on ordinary account this year of $67,000.

With the permission of the House, I now table the Interim Statement of Ordinary Revenue for the Fiscal Year April 1, 1952 to March 31, 1953, consisting of receipts for 10 months' actual and 2 months' forecast.

INTERIM STATEMENT OF ORDINARY REVENUE
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1952 - MARCH 31, 1953
10 MONTHS' ACTUAL PLUS 2 MONTHS' FORECAST

DEPARTMENT	Gross Ordinary Revenue	Application of Revenue to Expenditure	Net Ordinary Revenue
AGRICULTURE	$ 956,000.00	$	$ 956,000.00
ATTORNEY-GENERAL	3,385,000.00	480,000.00	2,905,000.00
EDUCATION	1,939,000.00	234,000.00	1,705,000.00
HEALTH	3,446,000.00	18,000.00	3,428,000.00
HIGHWAYS:			
Main Office	30,000.00		30,000.00
Gasoline Tax Branch	76,800,000.00		76,800,000.00
Motor Vehicles Branch	22,250,000.00		22,250,000.00
	$ 99,080,000.00	$	$ 99,080,000.00
INSURANCE	$ 342,000.00	$	$ 342,000.00
LABOUR	286,000.00	15,000.00	271,000.00
LANDS AND FORESTS	20,500,000.00		20,500,000.00
MINES	5,280,000.00	9,000.00	5,271,000.00
MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS	452,000.00		452,000.00
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	3,000.00		3,000.00
PRIME MINISTER	95,000.00		95,000.00
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY	848,000.00		848,000.00
PROVINCIAL TREASURER:			
Main Office - Subsidy	3,641,000.00		3,641,000.00
Interest	71,000.00		71,000.00
Miscellaneous	20,000.00		20,000.00
Liquor Control Board - Profits	42,000,000.00		42,000,000.00
Transfer Fees	750,000.00		750,000.00
Province of Ontario Savings Office	580,000.00	580,000.00	-
Provincial share of taxes collected from privately-owned corporations operating public utilities	670,000.00		670,000.00
Controller of Revenue:			
Tax Rental Agreement	123,327,000.00		123,327,000.00
Hospitals Tax	6,500,000.00		6,500,000.00
Succession Duty	18,500,000.00		18,500,000.00
Race Tracks Tax	3,640,000.00		3,640,000.00
Security Transfer Tax	1,762,000.00		1,762,000.00
Land Transfer Tax	2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00
Law Stamps	900,000.00		900,000.00
Logging Tax	850,000.00		850,000.00
Miscellaneous	1,000.00		1,000.00
Motion Picture Censorship and Theatre Inspection Branch	268,000.00		268,000.00
	$205,480,000.00	$ 580,000.00	$204,900,000.00
PUBLIC WELFARE	$ 10,000.00	$	$ 10,000.00
PUBLIC WORKS	84,000.00	3,000.00	81,000.00
REFORM INSTITUTIONS	2,843,000.00	2,335,000.00	508,000.00
TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY	63,000.00		63,000.00
PUBLIC DEBT - Interest, Exchange, etc.	9,762,000.00	9,762,000.00	-
	$354,854,000.00	$13,436,000.00	$341,418,000.00

I also table the Interim Statement of Ordinary Expenditure for the same fiscal period.

INTERIM STATEMENT OF ORDINARY EXPENDITURE
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1952 TO MARCH 31,1953
10 MONTHS' ACTUAL PLUS 2 MONTHS' FORECAST

DEPARTMENT	Gross Ordinary Expenditure	Application of Revenue to Expenditure	Net Ordinary Expenditure
AGRICULTURE.....	$ 8,348,000.00	$	$ 8,348,000.00
ATTORNEY-GENERAL.....	10,765,000.00	480,000.00	10,285,000.00
EDUCATION.....	76,250,000.00	234,000.00	76,016,000.00
HEALTH.....	52,370,000.00	18,000.00	52,352,000.00
HIGHWAYS.....	89,900,000.00		89,900,000.00
INSURANCE.....	149,000.00		149,000.00
LABOUR.....	1,478,000.00	15,000.00	1,463,000.00
LANDS AND FORESTS.....	11,610,000.00		11,610,000.00
LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.....	18,000.00		18,000.00
MINES.....	1,026,000.00	9,000.00	1,017,000.00
MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS.....	7,298,000.00		7,298,000.00
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT....	1,827,000.00		1,827,000.00
PRIME MINISTER.....	250,000.00		250,000.00
PROVINCIAL AUDITOR.....	246,000.00		246,000.00
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY.....	1,454,000.00		1,454,000.00
PROVINCIAL TREASURER.....	5,096,000.00	580,000.00	4,516,000.00
PUBLIC WELFARE.....	22,681,000.00		22,681,000.00
PUBLIC WORKS.....	4,586,000.00	3,000.00	4,583,000.00
REFORM INSTITUTIONS.....	8,206,000.00	2,335,000.00	5,871,000.00
TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY.....	1,268,000.00		1,268,000.00
STATIONERY ACCOUNT.....	30,000.00		30,000.00
	$304,856,000.00	$ 3,674,000.00	$301,182,000.00
Public Debt - Interest, Exchange, etc.....	32,072,000.00	9,762,000.00	22,310,000.00
	$336,928,000.00	$13,436,000.00	$323,492,000.00
Public Debt - Sinking Fund Instalments.....	17,859,000.00		17,859,000.00
	$354,787,000.00	$13,436,000.00	$341,351,000.00

I also table Summary of Ordinary Revenue and Ordinary Expenditure for the Fiscal Year April 1, 1952 to March 31, 1953. This summary shows an interim surplus, after provision for sinking fund, of $67,000.

SUMMARY

ORDINARY REVENUE AND ORDINARY EXPENDITURE
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1952 TO MARCH 31,1953
10 MONTHS' ACTUAL PLUS 2 MONTHS' FORECAST

Net Ordinary Revenue.....	$ 341,418,000.00
Less: Net Ordinary Expenditure (before providing for Sinking Funds).....	323,492,000.00
Balance (before providing for Sinking Funds)	$ 17,926,000.00
Less: Provision for Sinking Funds.....	17,859,000.00
Interim Surplus.....	$ 67,000.00

Surplus Account

Since 1944 we have consistently followed our debt retirement plan. This year, in addition to paying all of the costs of our operations on ordinary account, we have applied $9,359,000 on old debt and $8,500,000 against capital expenditures during the year. To this is added a surplus of $67,000, making an application of $17,926,000 on old debt and new capital investment for this year.

A statement of Surplus on Ordinary Account for the past three years and an estimate for the current year follows:

SUMMARY OF SURPLUS ON ORDINARY ACCOUNT

	Fiscal Year Ending March 31			
	1950	1951	1952	Interim Estimated 1953
et Ordinary Revenue	$228,550,022.27	$265,272,106.50	$302,320,998.85	$341,418,000.00
ess: Net Ordinary Expenditure (before provision for Sinking Funds)	199,271,373.67	228,090,424.26	266,983,559.94	323,492,000.00
alance (before provision for Sinking Funds)	$ 29,278,648.60	$ 37,181,682.24	$ 35,337,438.91	$ 17,926,000.00
ess: Provision for Sinking Funds	20,622,000.00	21,698,000.00	34,276,000.00	17,859,000.00
Balance carried to Surplus Account	$ 8,656,648.60	$ 15,483,682.24	$ 1,061,438.91	$ 67,000.00

I also table an Interim Statement of Capital Receipts and a Statement of Capital Payments for the Fiscal Year April 1, 1952 to March 31, 1953.

INTERIM STATEMENT OF CAPITAL RECEIPTS
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1952 TO MARCH 31, 1953
10 MONTHS' ACTUAL PLUS 2 MONTHS' FORECAST

DEPARTMENT	Gross Capital Receipts	Application of Receipts to Payments	Net Capital Receipts
HIGHWAYS	$ 1,547,000.00	$	$ 1,547,000.00
LABOUR	9,276,000.00		9,276,000.00
LANDS AND FORESTS	2,470,000.00		2,470,000.00
MINES	93,000.00		93,000.00
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	82,000.00		82,000.00
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY	4,710,000.00		4,710,000.00
PROVINCIAL TREASURER	82,024,000.00		82,024,000.00
PUBLIC WELFARE	5,290,000.00	5,290,000.00	
PUBLIC WORKS	296,000.00		296,000.00
	$105,788,000.00	$5,290,000.00	$100,498,000.00

INTERIM STATEMENT OF CAPITAL PAYMENTS
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1952 to MARCH 31, 1953
10 MONTHS' ACTUAL PLUS 2 MONTHS' FORECAST

DEPARTMENT	Gross Capital Payments	Application of Receipts to Payments	Net Capital Payments
AGRICULTURE.....	$ 9,990,000.00	$.....	$9,990,000.00
HEALTH.....	2,000,000.00	.....	2,000,000.00
HIGHWAYS.....	69,230,000.00	.....	69,230,000.00
LABOUR.....	8,890,000.00	.....	8,890,000.00
LANDS AND FORESTS.....	1,680,000.00	.....	1,680,000.00
MINES.....	800,000.00	.....	800,000.00
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT..	3,500,000.00	.....	3,500,000.00
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY.....	2,003,000.00	.....	2,003,000.00
PROVINCIAL TREASURER.....	50,843,000.00	.....	50,843,000.00
PUBLIC WELFARE.....	5,290,000.00	5,290,000.00	
PUBLIC WORKS.....	13,950,000.00		13,950,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS.....	86,000.00		86,000.00
	$168,262,000.00	$5,290,000.00	$162,972,000.00

I now table the statements of Gross Debt, Net Debt, Funded Debt and the Indirect Debt.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

STATEMENT SHOWING ESTIMATED INCREASE IN THE GROSS DEBT
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO END ON MARCH 31, 1953

Estimated Gross Debt as at March 31, 1953.....		$917,105,408.98
Gross Debt as at March 31, 1952.....		826,228,266.17
Estimated Increase for the fiscal year to end on March 31, 1953.....		$ 90,877,142.81
GROSS DEBT INCREASED BY:		
Capital Disbursements -		
Disbursements on Highways, Public Buildings, Works, etc.....	$99,690,000.00	
Less - Capital Receipts.....	2,983,175.00	
	$96,706,825.00	
Discount on Debentures issued during year	3,625,000.00	
Increase in Loans Receivable -		
The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario... $50,000,000.00		
Tile Drainage..... 300,000.00		
Co-operative Marketing Loans 190,000.00		
	50,490,000.00	
Increase in the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation - Investments.....	5,175,462.19	
Increase in the Ontario Junior Farmer Establishment Loan Corporation - Investments	750,000.00	
Increase in Income Liabilities.....	223,160.28	
		$156,970,447.47
GROSS DEBT DECREASED BY:		
Sinking Fund Provision charged to Ordinary Expenditure.....	$17,859,000.00	
Estimated Surplus on Ordinary Account.	67,000.00	
	$17,926,000.00	
Discount on Debentures written off or assumed.....	2,873,000.00	
Repayments of Loans Receivable -		
The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.... $11,990,000.00		
Agricultural Development Finance Act Investments.. 1,401,000.00		
Miscellaneous - net..... 517,000.00		
	13,908,000.00	
Decrease in Cash on Hand and in Banks.	28,589,738.10	
Decrease in the Housing Corporation Limited Investments.....	1,500,595.02	
Increase in Reserves - net.....	1,295,971.54	
		66,093,304.66
Estimated Increase for the fiscal year to end on March 31, 1953.....		$ 90,877,142.81

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

ESTIMATED INCREASE IN THE NET DEBT
AS AT MARCH 31, 1953

Estimated as at March 31, 1953:	
Estimated Gross Debt.....	$ 917,105,408.98
Less - Estimated Revenue Producing and Realizable Assets.....	283,913,091.66
Estimated Net Debt.....	$ 633,192,317.32
As at March 31, 1952:	
Gross Debt.....	$826,228,266.17
Less - Revenue Producing and Realizable Assets...	271,593,462.59
Net Debt.....	$ 554,634,803.58
Estimated Increase in Net Debt (subject to Note below).....	$ 78,557,513.74

Note - As against Net Debt above as at March 31, 1953, the following items are held:-

Highway Reserve Account.....	$ 30,000,000.00
Corporation Tax Suspense Account....	16,000,000.00
	$ 46,000,000.00

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

DETAIL SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED CHANGES IN THE FUNDED DEBT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR TO END ON MARCH 31, 1953

As at March 31, 1952 (after deducting Sinking Funds)			$670,273,500.00
ADD - Sale of Debentures:			
BX	3½% due June 30, 1962	$ 27,500,000.00	
BY	4% due June 30, 1972	27,500,000.00	
TI	4½% due November 1, 1992 .	9,000,000.00	
BZ	3¼% due February 1, 1975 .	50,000,000.00	114,000,000.00
			$784,273,500.00
LESS - Redemptions:			
AB	5% due April 1, 1952	$ 13,986,000.00	
RN	3¼% due May 1, 1952	14,621,000.00	
AL	4% due May 15, 1952	804,000.00	
AP	4½% due May 15, 1952	752,000.00	
AS	4% due June 1, 1952	667,000.00	
BM	1 7/8% due July 15, 1952 .	500,000.00	
RZ	2½% due August 1, 1952 ...	1,000,000.00	
AK	4½% due November 1, 1952 .	799,000.00	
AH	4½% due December 1, 1952 .	700,000.00	
RA-D	2 3/8% due December 15,1952	2,000,000.00	
CF	2 3/4% due January 15, 1953	100,000.00	
AJ	4½% due January 15, 1953 .	800,000.00	
AR	4½% due January 15, 1953 .	653,000.00	
RB	3% due January 15, 1953 ..	500,000.00	
BN	1 7/8% due January 15, 1953	1,500,000.00	
CF	2 3/4% due January 15, 1955	50,000.00	
BV	3¼% due September 1, 1972	1,500,000.00	
		$ 40,932,000.00	
Increase in Sinking Fund Investments - Current Year		17,859,000.00	
			58,791,000.00
Estimated as at March 31, 1953 (after deducting Sinking Funds).....			$725,482,500.00

SUMMARY

New Issues	$114,000,000.00
Less - Redemptions and increase in Sinking Funds	58,791,000.00
Net Increase in Funded Debt ..	$ 55,209,000.00

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

CONTINGENT LIABILITIES, BONDS, ETC., GUARANTEED BY THE PROVINCE ESTIMATED AS AT MARCH 31, 1953

Total as per Public Accounts, March 31, 1952.....		$574,479,645.83
ADD - New Guarantees or Increases for the Fiscal Year to end on March 31, 1953 -		
Power Commission.....	$150,000,000.00	
Railway.....	5,500,000.00	
Co-operative Associations.....	5,000.00	
Ontario Food Terminal Board.....	48,000.00	
		155,553,000.00
		$730,032,645.83
LESS - Principal Maturities redeemed or to be redeemed, including redemptions prior to maturity, during the Fiscal Year to end on March 31, 1953 -		
Power Commission.....	$ 1,059,000.00	
Park Commissions.....	300,600.00	
Railway.....	1,500,000.00	
Schools.....	77,431.71	
University.....	85,010.41	
Co-operative Associations.....	112,750.00	
Ontario Stock Yards Board.....	100,000.00	
		3,174,792.12
		$726,857,853.71
LESS - Sinking Fund Deposits for the Fiscal Year to end on March 31, 1953.....		906.31
Estimated Contingent Liability of the Province as at March 31, 1953.....		$726,856,947.40

SUMMARY

Estimated Contingent Liability of the Province as at March 31, 1953.....	$726,856,947.40
Contingent Liability of the Province as at March 31, 1952.....	574,479,645.83
Estimated Increase.....	$152,377,301.57

WAYS AND MEANS

The Problem Ahead

There are many new problems and developments ahead. We are faced with continuing large scale operations for highways, hydro electric power and the conservation and development of our resources. As I said last March in my Budget Address, "The future productiveness of our industrial structure depends on how wisely we are able to add to our capital stock. A high rate of investment in production facilities gives better assurance that the problems and tasks of tomorrow will be lighter than those of today".

Many factors will influence our course. Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements and provincial-municipal fiscal arrangements, for instance, are very important. But common to all economic and social activity in the Province is our growing population. It affects virtually all services and explains in part our increased expenditures and, therefore, our need for increased revenues.

Last year Ontario's population increased by 168,000. It may be noted that whereas Canada's population a year ago increased by 3.0 per cent, Ontario's population rose by 3.7 per cent. In the first six months of this year, the number of births in Ontario was 3.6 per cent higher than a year ago. Our population has grown most rapidly at the two ends of the scale, that is, the children of school age, and our more senior citizens, sixty and over. While our total population has increased by 28 per cent since 1941, the number of children fifteen and under has increased by 41 per cent and the number of persons sixty years and over has risen by 35 per cent. These figures have implications which cannot be ignored. In education the most pressing problems are caused by the very rapid rise in school enrolments, the impact of which is already felt and is expected to continue for many additional years. Over the next decade, upwards of 50,000 additional pupils must be admitted to the schools each year. This will necessitate an even higher rate of school construction than we have yet experienced. 250 new school

buildings or substantial additions to existing schools were erected during the past year at a cost of nearly $46 million. New school accommodation was provided for 50,410, but the actual increase in pupil enrolment was 54,000. It will therefore be seen that even this large-scale construction program did not quite meet the demand. In 1953 there will be at least a 10 per cent increase in building accommodation.

It will also be necessary to provide teaching facilities and to recruit the thousands of new teachers necessary to meet these requirements. At the present time the enrolment in secondary schools is not so serious because of the low birth rate in the early 1940's but there is nothing more certain than that this situation will change and that very substantial additional high school accommodation will have to be provided.

To provide additional teaching facilities two new teachers' colleges will be erected without delay, one in Toronto to replace the present Normal School, which in this year was forced to operate on double shifts, and the other to replace the Normal School in Hamilton, which was destroyed by fire.

The importance of higher education and continued study by adult citizens is reflected in the appropriations for grants for the maintenance of the universities in the coming fiscal year. As I have pointed out, maintenance grants to the universities in the present year totalled $6,502,000. Next year they will amount to $6,955,000, an increase of $453,000. Adding to the $6.9 million the grants payable to universities for capital purposes out of this year's revenues raises the amount of provincial aid to the universities to nearly $9 million. All told, the Provincial Government's bill for education in the year 1953-54 will amount to $78,004,000, including grants of $58,380,000 to school boards and an additional $1,035,000 to libraries and community centres.

Provision for Highways

As it is with schools, so it is with highways, public buildings, conservation projects, hospitals and other provincial services. There is a more or less direct relationship between the growth in population and the need for additional public services. In some recent years, the increase in motor vehicle registrations has exceeded the increase in our population. Many new and improved highways must be provided if the great caravans of traffic are to move at a reasonable speed throughout this Province. No small scale nibbling at the highway problem will suffice. It must be attacked across a broad front. This budget is a great developmental budget for which there is no parallel in our history. It will be an investment, and a paying investment, in Ontario.

We estimate that $153.0 million will be spent on highways in the fiscal year 1953-54. This amount, unprecedented in the Province, will be provided as follows:

Highway Reserve Account (voted as supplementary estimates in the fiscal year 1952-53)		$ 30,000,000
To be voted for 1953-54		
On Ordinary Account -		
Maintenance, Municipal Subsidies and Administration Expenses	$ 58,000,000	
Highway Reserve Account	23,000,000	81,000,000
On Capital Account -		
Department of Highways	$ 41,000,000	
Department of Mines	1,000,000	42,000,000
		$153,000,000

The Province-wide distribution of the capital construction portion of this program, estimated to cost $95,000,000, is shown in the following summary:

Capital - Under Construction and Proposed New Work:

1. South Western Ontario Divisions - (Chatham, Windsor, London, Stratford, Owen Sound, etc.) and including such special items as divided highways in the Windsor-Chatham and London-Woodstock areas and the London By-pass.	$ 11,362,000

2. Central Southern Ontario Divisions - (Hamilton, Toronto, Port Hope, etc.) and including such special items as Toronto By-pass, Orillia By-pass, Barrie By-pass, divided highway east of Oshawa, New highway Pontypool-Peterboro, Highway 69 Washago-Brechin, Newcastle to Orono, Queen Elizabeth Highway near Oakville, Freeman to Wolfe Island and approaches to Burlington Bridge.	$ 19,630,000
3. South Eastern Ontario Divisions - (Kingston, Ottawa, Pembroke, Bancroft, etc.) and including such special items as Kingston By-pass, Alumette Island Bridge and Trans-Canada on Highways 7 and 17 east of Ottawa and New Ferry-Adolphustown.	9,520,000
4. North Central and North Eastern Ontario Divisions - (Huntsville, North Bay, Sudbury, New Liskeard, Cochrane, Sault Ste. Marie, Blind River, etc.) including such special items as North Bay By-pass, Trans-Canada in Huntsville, Sudbury areas, grading in Hawk Junction (20 miles east and west, 10 miles east of White River, 10 miles west of Chapleau), work between Hawk River and Michipicoten Harbour and a continuation of the Montreal River road northward.	19,891,000
5. North Western Ontario Divisions - (Fort William, Kenora, etc.) including such special items as Atikokan Highway and Trans-Canada in Fort William area, east and west.	9,863,000
6. Property, Buildings, Bridges, Surveys, etc.	5,209,000
7. For elimination of level crossings to be supplemented by matching federal and railway grants.	2,000,000
8. Amount allotted to municipalities under the Municipal Roads Branch.	16,525,000
9. Allotted for capital construction on Mining Roads.	1,000,000
	$ 95,000,000
Ordinary:	
Maintenance of King's Highways and Development Roads and administration expenses of Department.	38,218,000
Renovating and resurfacing present roads.	3,000,000
Amount allotted to municipalities for maintenance under Municipal Roads Branch.	16,782,000
	$153,000,000

Public Buildings and Works

To meet the essential needs resulting from our growing population, a large scale program of public buildings and other capital improvements has been undertaken. Included in this program are the following projects, totalling more than $65 million, which are now under way or planned. Part of the cost has been financed during the fiscal year 1952-53 and we are providing the sum of $22 million in next year's Estimates for furthering this work.

Offices in Toronto Area		
New Treasury Building		$2,600,000
New Office Building and Annex to Osgoode Hall		2,500,000
Yardley House		
Purchase Price	$1,035,000	
Alterations and Renovations	250,000	1,285,000
New Compensation Board Building nearing completion		2,905,000
New Reformatory Project at Millbrook		2,500,000
Health Program to increase Bed Accommodation		
Ontario Hospital - Smith's Falls		
To continue Medical-Surgical Group, Assembly Hall, Gymnasium Building, Administration Building, School Building, Nurses' Home, Sewers and other work		6,500,000
Ontario Hospital - Kingston		
Additional unit to provide 500 beds, including Assembly Hall		3,500,000
Ontario Hospital - Brockville		
To continue erection of extension of cottages to provide accommodation for 700 patients, including alterations to provide additional facilities in dining-room, central kitchen and food service centre		4,200,000
Ontario Hospital - Toronto		
New reception unit with administration centre and diagnostic clinics		2,470,000
Ontario Hospital - London		
400 bed increase in capacity		2,800,000
Ontario Hospital - North Bay		
Construction of a new Mental Hospital to provide 1200 beds		9,000,000
Ontario Hospital - Port Arthur		
Construction of a new Mental Hospital to provide 1200 beds. (Construction of first unit 460 beds completed; second unit underway for 424 beds; plans being prepared for additional units)		7,630,000
Ontario Hospital - Orillia		
Construction of new unit for children, including an isolation section for 376 beds		2,680,000

New Power Plant	$ 450,000
Agriculture	
O.A.C. Guelph	
To continue construction of an addition to MacDonald Institute	100,000
Construction of a field husbandry research building, including seed cleaning plant	285,000
New Water Reservoir	150,000
Major Electrical improvements, including new sub-station	100,000
To start on new gymnasium building	75,000
Agricultural School - Ridgetown	
New Assembly Hall (construction underway)	160,000
Agricultural School - Kemptville	
New Agricultural Engineering Building (work underway)	400,000
Food Terminal Building - Etobicoke	
Construction of new Food Terminal Building (work underway)	3,605,000
Highway Stores and Buildings	
Wilson Avenue and Keele Streets, Toronto	
Central Stores, Office Building and Laboratory Building, to replace 1200 Sheppard Avenue required by Dominion	3,000,000
Attorney-General	
Construction of additions to new Registry Office Buildings at Sudbury and Bracebridge and new Registry Office at Port Arthur	680,000
Provincial Police	
New Headquarters Building at Port Arthur	210,000
New Detachment Buildings at Long Lac, Ignace, Chapleau, White River, Sioux Narrows, Missanabie	350,000
Fifty (50) residences in Northern Ontario	500,000
Minden-Haliburton County Buildings and accommodation for Ontario Provincial Police	135,000
Lands and Forests	
Research Station - Maple	
New Pathological Building (underway)	375,000
Sault Ste. Marie	
Construction of a Chief Ranger's Headquarters	240,000
North Bay (at Trout Lake)	
Chief Ranger's Headquarters (work underway)	210,000

Education	
New Teachers' Colleges:	
Toronto - to replace the Normal School at Pape Avenue	$ 2,200,000
Hamilton - New Teachers' College to replace Normal School destroyed by fire	1,000,000
School for the Blind - Brantford	
Construction of a Junior School and Hospital Building (construction underway)	550,000
Total -	$65,345,000

Conservation

The conservation and development of the Province's natural resources of forest, mine, soil and water continue to receive the closest attention of the Government. During 1952-1953, the Government spent $14.5 million on conservation projects carried out by the Departments of Lands and Forests, Agriculture, Public Works, Planning and Development, and Mines. During the coming year they will spend $16.4 million. In addition, as I have previously mentioned, a shelf of plans has been prepared for flood control and soil conservation involving an expenditure of $41 million.

Rural Power Extensions

Rural power extensions are also being carried out by Hydro on much the same scale as in past years. $9,700,000 is being placed in the estimates to provide the Province's share of the cost of these capital acquisitions. We shall add another 25,000 customers. The fruits of these undertakings and of the community halls and recreation centres which are also financed in part by the Province are being harvested in the greater efficiency of our farms and the improved amenities of rural life. Let us remember that our great rural background is the sheet anchor in our economy. The benefits in this budget for schools, rinks, playing fields, roads, rural hydro, hospitals, and a host of other things, are all calculated to strengthen and improve the rural way of life.

Housing

Judged by the number of housing starts and carry-overs at the end of the year, 1953 should be an excellent year for the construction of housing in Ontario, and 1954 should be even better. A quarter of our population in the Toronto metropolitan area, where housing has been most needed, has been bound by an outmoded system of municipal government. In this metropolitan area, where we have experienced the greatest difficulty in providing low-cost dwellings, many restrictions on housing should be immediately eased by the creation of the Metropolitan Government which, when it gets down to business next year, will be responsible for public housing, as well as sewers, water and assistance payments for education in an area of 245 square miles.

We are placing in the 1953-54 Estimates $10 million to carry out the Government's housing program, which is a partnership arrangement with the Federal Government on a 25-75 per cent basis. Many signs point to 1953 being a record year in housing construction.

During the present year partnership arrangements have been made with the following municipalities:

Dunnville	Lindsay	Peterborough	Sault Ste. Marie
Fort Erie	London	Port Arthur	Stamford
Galt	Midland	Port Hope	Stratford
Goderich	Owen Sound	Sarnia	

Previously rental or combination land assembly and rental projects had been carried out in:

Brockville	Hamilton	Trenton
Fort William	Prescott	Windsor
Guelph	St. Thomas	

Negotiations are also being carried out for housing projects with 17 other municipalities:

Amherstburg	Cornwall	North Bay	Smith's Falls
Arnprior	Hawkesbury	Orillia	Welland
Barrie	Kenora	Prescott	
Brantford	Kapuskasing	Port Hope	
Cobourg	London	Renfrew	

Summing Up

In emphasizing the importance of the development of our capital assets we have been mindful of the need for human betterment. This is indicated by the extensive legislative program which we have adopted in the last several years and which is now in full swing. But we also see very clearly that it is only by economic development and industry that we are able to support a broad advance in the social welfare field. We have carried out a full program of public services and yet we have kept our taxes among the lowest in the Canadian provinces. Our aim is a sound and healthy economy which gives full play to initiative and enterprise. It is a province that is friendly to capital investment and industrial expansion. It is a place where men and women may exercise freedom in the choice of their own vocations, and where thrift, ability and hard work are encouraged and justly rewarded.

No New Taxes

I have the pleasure of again making a statement regarding taxes that I have now made for several years:

There will be no new taxes.

There will be no increase in rates of present taxes.

There will be tax reductions.

More complete details of these tax reductions are shown in the Appendix, but a brief summary would include the following:

1. Resulting from our suspension of corporation taxes under the Tax Rental Agreement, we have made available to corporations a reduction in their taxes of 2 per cent on their income as well as the removal of the special capital and place of business taxes which combined, provide, on the average, a net saving to corporations of 2.6 per cent on Ontario income.
2. Provisions are being made to allow corporations to deduct from income special payments made to pension funds in respect to past services of employees. This will bring our deductions in line with Federal allowances.

3. Provision is being made to relieve corporations from filing corporation tax returns made possible by the Canada-Ontario tax rental agreement.
4. Provision is being made to relieve widows and the preferred class of beneficiaries from the payment of duty on the first $50,000 of value on any estate.
5. The Race Tracks tax, which is now graded from 8 per cent to 12 per cent, will be reduced to a straight 8 per cent.
6. The mortgage tax now applicable in Toronto, York County and Hamilton and which is to be abolished with the new unconditional subsidies coming into effect after January 1st, 1954, will be repealed April 1st, 1953, and the municipalities concerned will be compensated for the balance of this year so that they will sustain no loss in the revenue for which they have budgeted. This will assist housing and the home owner.

Tax Reductions in the Last Five Years

These reductions continue the tax relief which we have been able to extend to taxpayers over the past five years. During this period, we have introduced no new taxes, save the 9 per cent logging tax which was imposed in lieu of the normal 7 per cent provincial corporation tax. And, as this logging tax was deductible from income before Federal taxation, whereas the corporation tax was not, the change-over provided a slight reduction to the companies concerned. For five years we have managed each year to give some tax reductions. We have increased only one tax in that time; that was the tax on race tracks in 1950, when the Racing Commission was established. We are now lowering that tax by the amount of 2 per cent below even the 1949 level.

FORECAST OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

We are estimating the net ordinary revenue of the Government for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1954 at $334,733,000 and the net ordinary expenditure before provision for sinking funds at $320,103,000. We are providing for sinking funds $14,445,000, thus leaving us with an estimated surplus of $185,000.

The largest single item on the expenditure side is highways, comprising $81.0 million on ordinary account, which includes $23.0 million for the Highway Reserve Account, and $41.0 million on capital - a total of $122.0 million. This, combined with $30.0 million placed to Highway Reserve Account in 1952-53,makes a total of $152.0 million which is no less than $53.0 million more than the appropriation a year ago.

BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 1953-54

With your permission I now place on the records of the House the budget forecast of Ordinary Revenue, Ordinary Expenditure, Summary, Capital Receipts and Capital Payments for the fiscal year April 1, 1953 to March 31, 1954 and I forecast a surplus of $185,000.

BUDGET FORECAST OF ORDINARY REVENUE
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1953 - MARCH 31, 1954

DEPARTMENT	Gross Ordinary Revenue	Application of Revenue to Expenditure	Net Ordinary Revenue
AGRICULTURE	$ 914,000	$	$ 914,000
ATTORNEY-GENERAL	3,261,000	529,000	2,732,000
EDUCATION	1,687,000	605,000	1,082,000
HEALTH	4,029,000	519,000	3,510,000
HIGHWAYS:			
Main Office.....	30,000		30,000
Gasoline Tax Branch	79,000,000		79,000,000
Motor Vehicles Branch	22,000,000		22,000,000
	$101,030,000,	$	$101,030,000
INSURANCE	$ 320,000	$	$ 320,000
LABOUR	498,000	12,000	486,000
LANDS AND FORESTS	15,975,000		15,975,000
MINES	5,592,000	8,000	5,584,000
MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS	446,000		446,000
PRIME MINISTER	99,000		99,000
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY	790,000		790,000
PROVINCIAL TREASURER			
Main Office - Subsidy	3,641,000		3,641,000
Interest	71,000		71,000
Liquor Control Board - Profits	36,000,000		36,000,000
Transfer Fees	600,000		600,000
Province of Ontario - Savings Office	613,000	613,000	
Provincial Share of Taxes collected from privately owned Corporations operating Public Utilities	670,000		670,000
Controller of Revenue:			
Tax Rental Agreement	131,000,000		131,000,000
Hospitals Tax	6,000,000		6,000,000
Succession Duty	15,000,000		15,000,000
Race Tracks Tax	3,500,000		3,500,000
Security Transfer Tax	1,200,000		1,200,000
Land Transfer Tax	1,800,000		1,800,000
Law Stamps	800,000		800,000
Logging Tax	500,000		500,000
Motion Picture Censorship and Theatre Inspection Branch	262,000		262,000
	$201,657,000	$ 613,000	$201,044,000
PUBLIC WORKS	$ 40,000	$	$ 40,000
REFORM INSTITUTIONS	3,017,000	2,487,000	530,000
TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY	51,000		51,000
MISCELLANEOUS	100,000		100,000
	$339,506,000	$ 4,773,000	334,733,000
PUBLIC DEBT - Interest, Exchange, etc..	11,488,000	11,488,000	
	$350,994,000	$ 16,261,000	$334,733,000

BUDGET FORECAST OF ORDINARY EXPENDITURE
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1953 - MARCH 31, 1954

DEPARTMENT	Gross Ordinary Expenditure	Application of Revenue to Expenditure	Net Ordinary Expenditure
AGRICULTURE	$ 8,914,000.00	$	$ 8,914,000.00
ATTORNEY-GENERAL	11,500,000.00	529,000.00	10,971,000.00
EDUCATION	78,609,000.00	605,000.00	78,004,000.00
HEALTH	46,427,000.00	519,000.00	45,908,000.00
HIGHWAYS	81,000,000.00		81,000,000.00
INSURANCE	153,000.00		153,000.00
LABOUR	1,661,000.00	12,000.00	1,649,000.00
LANDS AND FORESTS	12,610,000.00		12,610,000.00
LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR	20,000.00		20,000.00
MINES	1,092,000.00	8,000.00	1,084,000.00
MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS	9,300,000.00		9,300,000.00
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	1,776,000.00		1,776,000.00
PRIME MINISTER	295,000.00		295,000.00
PROVINCIAL AUDITOR	269,000.00		269,000.00
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY ...	1,465,000.00		1,465,000.00
PROVINCIAL TREASURER ...	4,445,000.00	613,000.00	3,832,000.00
PUBLIC WELFARE	26,201,000.00		26,201,000.00
PUBLIC WORKS	5,064,000.00		5,064,000.00
REFORM INSTITUTIONS	8,545,000.00	2,487,000.00	6,058,000.00
TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY ...	1,495,000.00		1,495,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS	100,000.00		100,000.00
	$300,941,000.00	$ 4,773,000.00	$296,168,000.00
PUBLIC DEBT - Interest, Exchange, etc.	35,423,000.00	11,488,000.00	23,935,000.00
	$336,364,000.00	$16,261,000.00	$320,103,000.00
PUBLIC DEBT - Sinking Fund Instalments	14,445,000.00		14,445,000.00
	$350,809,000.00	$16,261,000.00	$334,548,000.00

S U M M A R Y

BUDGET FORECAST
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1953 - MARCH 31, 1954

Net Ordinary Revenue	$334,733,000.00
Less: Net Ordinary Expenditure (before providing for Sinking Funds)	320,103,000.00
Balance (before providing for Sinking Funds)	$ 14,630,000.00
Less: Provision for Sinking Funds	14,445,000.00
Surplus Forecast	$ 185,000.00

BUDGET FORECAST OF CAPITAL RECEIPTS
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1953 - MARCH 31, 1954

Department	Gross Capital Receipts	Application of Receipts to Payments	Net Capital Receipts
HIGHWAYS	$ 2,105,000	$	$ 2,105,000
LABOUR	9,500,000		9,500,000
LANDS AND FORESTS	2,625,000		2,625,000
MINES	70,000		70,000
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY	4,760,000		4,760,000
PROVINCIAL TREASURER	49,021,000		49,021,000
PUBLIC WELFARE	5,893,000	5,893,000	
	$ 73,974,000	$ 5,893,000	$ 68,081,000

BUDGET FORECAST OF CAPITAL PAYMENTS
FISCAL YEAR APRIL 1, 1953 - MARCH 31, 1954

Department	Gross Capital Payments	Application of Receipts to Payments	Net Capital Payments
AGRICULTURE	$ 9,950,000		$ 9,950,000
HIGHWAYS	43,100,000		43,100,000
LABOUR	9,500,000		9,500,000
LANDS AND FORESTS	800,000		800,000
MINES.....	1,000,000		1,000,000
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.	10,000,000		10,000,000
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY	2,195,000		2,195,000
PROVINCIAL TREASURER	2,740,000		2,740,000
PUBLIC WELFARE.....	5,893,000	5,893,000	
PUBLIC WORKS	24,675,000		24,675,000
MISCELLANEOUS.....	150,000		150,000
	$110,003,000	$ 5,893,000	$104,110,000

SUMMARY

FISCAL YEAR 1952-53

Mr. Speaker: Before concluding my address, I should like briefly to summarize our accomplishments of this fiscal year and our program for the next year.

1. Surplus on Ordinary Account in the fiscal year 1953 amounts to $67,000 after providing for sinking funds the sum of $17,859,000 and for the Highway Reserve Account the sum of $30 million.
2. This is this Government's tenth consecutive surplus since assuming office in 1943.
3. Special capital grants of $8.5 million are being paid to public hospitals for rehabilitation of worn-out and obsolete equipment.
4. Assistance to public general hospitals is: maintenance $9,350,000, capital construction $4,500,000, and the special rehabilitation grant of $8,500,000, making total assistance to hospitals $22,350,000.
5. Special capital grants are being made to Ontario universities of $1.9 million, distributed as follows:

University of Toronto (other capital requirements of this university have been otherwise provided)	$ 200,000
Queen's University	525,000
University of Western Ontario	525,000
McMaster University	250,000
University of Ottawa	250,000
Carleton College	150,000
Total	$1,900,000

6. A special contribution is being made to the Teachers' Superannuation Fund of $1 million.

7. A special grant is being made to the Royal Botanical Gardens of Hamilton of $100,000.

8. The Highway Reserve Account is being brought up to $30 million by an additional vote of $10 million.

9. In addition to the provision for Highway Reserve Account, the total Highway expenditure for ordinary and capital will exceed $127 million this fiscal year. This is an all-time record.

10. We have, through the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation, purchased $5,064,000 of the debentures of municipal corporations issued for purposes such as waterworks and sewers during the fiscal year 1952-53. Since the inception of this Corporation, we have purchased municipal debentures totalling $15,419,000.

11. The tax rental agreement, signed with the Federal authorities on October 29, 1952, covering personal and corporation income taxes, will yield $123.3 million this year.

12. As a result of this tax rental agreement, tax reductions of 2 per cent on corporation profits plus all capital and place of business taxes accrued to Ontario corporations.

13. The Province raised $50 million in New York for Ontario Hydro and guaranteed its issues of $150 million in the Canadian market for the financing of its huge development program. Yet, Ontario's credit standing was never higher.

14. We are paying the Province's share of the rural power expansion program amounting to $9.8 million.

Fiscal Year 1953-54

15. As Treasurer, I forecast another "pay as you go budget" with an estimated surplus of $185,000, after providing $14,445,000 for sinking funds and $23 million for the Highway Reserve Account.

16. This will be the Government's eleventh consecutive surplus on ordinary account since it assumed office in 1943.

17. The Government will inaugurate a program to abolish level railway crossings and is providing an initial payment of $2 million.

18. To overtake the 20 year back-log of deferred highway construction and maintenance, the Department of Highways will undertake a program involving an expenditure of $153 million in the coming year.

19. $10 million is being provided in the Estimates as Ontario's share in carrying out various housing projects in a $40 million partnership program with the Federal Government.

20. Grants to all municipalities and associated bodies will amount to $121.2 million, $4.7 million more than in the present year, excluding special capital grants.

21. The Department of Education appropriation is $78.6 million, an increase of $6.2 million over the appropriation made a year ago.

22. The appropriation for maintenance grants to Universities is being increased in 1953-54 by $1.3 million over 1952-53 Estimates.

	Estimates 1952-53	Estimates 1953-54
	$	$
University of Toronto	3,772,000	4,700,000
Ontario College of Education	420,000	470,000
Queen's University	550,000	625,000
University of Western Ontario	550,000	625,000
McMaster University (for instruction in the Sciences)	150,000	200,000
University of Ottawa (Medical Faculty)	150,000	200,000
Carleton College	100,000	135,000
	$5,692,000	$6,955,000

23. Legislative grants to elementary and secondary schools will amount to $58.4 million, an increase of $3.9 million over last year.

24. Some additional appropriations for the development of human resources are as follows: Health is increased by $3 million to a total of $46.4 million and Welfare to $26.2 million.

25. The provision for the maintenance of Ontario Mental Hospitals is $18.5 million, an increase of $2.1 million over last year.

26. The Department of Public Works appropriation for the construction of new buildings is $22 million, an increase of $5 million over last year.

27. For conservation, we are providing in the estimates of the various departments $16.4 million and for the Federal-Provincial partnership we have prepared plans involving an expenditure of $41 million.

28. For the betterment of agriculture and rural Ontario we are providing $9.7 million for rural hydro extensions; the ordinary expenditures of the Department have been increased to $8.9 million.

29. For completion of standardization of fire fighting equipment as a help to municipalities $300,000 is being provided to complete the program.

30. There are reductions in corporation tax for employees' pension funds, succession duties, and race tracks tax; the Mortgage Tax, for which municipalities will be reimbursed, is being abolished.

31. There will be no new taxes and no increase in rates of present taxes.

CONCLUSION

In reporting on the current year's activities - and this year, Mr. Speaker, rounds out ten years of my stewardship as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario - I think the members of this honourable body will agree with me when I assert with unaffected sincerity that Ontario's progress during the past ten years constitutes a record of achievement unsurpassed by any comparable public authority anywhere on this continent. This impressive record - for it is most impressive - has been possible of accomplishment, in large measure, because of our great heritage.

We are debtors for this heritage that has made possible all we are and have to-day: the sustaining faith of those pioneers who laid the foundations of our provincial institutions; the breadth of vision of the Fathers of Confederation who established our Canada as a nation; the freedoms that are ours, freedom to worship as we will, to speak the things that we believe, to attempt new methods of production, to venture into fields of endeavour that make for increased human enjoyment and for the betterment of all, spiritually as well as materially. This heritage commands our eternal gratitude and inspires within us a realization of our own obligations to the future. In this spirit, entering as we are upon another year of opportunity, we dedicate ourselves to the task of making 1953-54 a notable year of progress, a year outstripping the achievements of the best of our former years. That this is possible, we firmly believe, and this we shall strive to attain, relying as we shall upon the support of all of the honourable members of this assembly and indeed of all the people of this Grand Old Province of Ontario.

APPENDICES

CONTENTS

		Page
A.	GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS	
1.	Special Grants to Hospitals	2 - 9
2.	Summary of Tax Reductions and Amendments	10 - 13
3.	Assistance to Municipalities by the Province of Ontario, Fiscal Year 1951 to 1954	14
4.	Provincial Debt, March 31, 1952	15
5.	Gross Provincial Debt, March 31, 1952	16
6.	Net Provincial Debt, March 31, 1952	17
B.	ECONOMIC TRENDS AND INDICES	
1.	Ontario's Population, Births, Deaths and Natural Increase, 1939 to 1952	18
2.	Immigrant Arrivals, Ontario and Canada, Selected Years 1939 to 1952	19
3.	Housing Starts, Completions and Carry-Overs in Ontario, 1945 to 1952	20
4.	Personal Income in Ontario and Canada, 1939 to 1952	21
5.	Wages, Salaries and Supplementary Labour Income in Ontario and Canada, Selected Years 1939 to 1952	22
6.	Net Income of Agriculture and Other Unincorporated Business in Ontario and Canada, Selected Years 1939 to 1952	23
7.	Combined Private and Public Capital Investment in Ontario and Canada, 1940 to 1952	24
8.	Capital Investment in Ontario, By Industry, 1950 to 1952	25
9.	Estimate of Provincial-Municipal Capital Investment in Ontario, 1949-50 to 1952-53	26
10.	Current Expenditures by the Government of Ontario and All Levels of Government in Canada as a Percentage of Personal Income, Fiscal Years 1938-39 and 1951-52	27
11.	Estimated Tax Collections in Ontario by the Three Levels of Government, Fiscal Years 1938-39 and 1951-52	27

A. GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS

1. SPECIAL GRANTS TO HOSPITALS

The Government is this year providing hospitals with additional grants for renovation and rehabilitation of facilities and equipment. $400 will be paid for each bed for which a capital grant has not been paid since April 1, 1947 and $100 for each bed for which a grant has been paid or approv since April 1, 1947.

Interim calculations for the larger portion of the hospitals concerned are as follows:

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Ajax	Ajax General Hospital	-	34	$ 3,400
Alliston	Stevenson Memorial Hospital	29	-	11,600
Almonte	Rosemond Memorial Hospital	15		6,000
Apsley	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	5	-	2,000
Arnprior	Arnprior and District Memorial Hospital	39	-	15,600
Atikokan	Atikokan General Hospital	-	13	1,300
Bancroft	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	-	22	2,200
Barrie	Royal Victoria Hospital of Barrie	46	86	27,000
Beardmore	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	-	8	800
Belleville	Belleville General Hospital	136	-	54,400
Blind River	St. Joseph's General Hospital	34	-	13,600
Bowmanville	Bowmanville Hospital	-	50	5,000
Bracebridge	Bracebridge Memorial Hospital	19	12	8,800
Brampton	Peel Memorial Hospital	30	44	16,400
Brantford	The Brantford General Hospital	284	80	121,600
Brockville	Brockville General Hospital	116	61	52,500
Brockville	St. Vincent de Paul Hospital	72	18	30,600
Burk's Falls	Burk's Falls and District Red Cross Hospital	-	22	2,200
Burlington	Children's Convalescent Hospital	41	-	16,400
Campbellford	Campbellford Memorial Hospital	-	61	6,100
Carleton Place	Carleton Place and District Memorial Hospital	-	33	3,300
Chapleau	Lady Minto Hospital	28	-	11,200
Chatham	Public General Hospital	161	-	64,400
Chatham	St. Joseph's Hospital	118		47,200

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Chesley	The Chesley and District Memorial Hospital	-	22	$ 2,200
Clinton	Clinton Public Hospital	12	21	6,900
Cobourg	Cobourg General Hospital	34	4	14,000
Cobourg	Illahee Lodge	52	-	20,800
Cochrane	Lady Minto Hospital	45	-	18,000
Collingwood	Blue Mountain Camp	24	20	11,600
Collingwood	General and Marine Hospital	58	4	23,600
Cornwall	Cornwall General Hospital	67	84	35,200
Cornwall	Hotel Dieu Hospital	136	-	54,400
Dryden	Dryden District General Hospital	23	-	9,200
Dunnville	Haldimand War Memorial Hospital	-	48	4,800
Durham	Durham Memorial Hospital	16	-	6,400
Emo	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	17	-	6,800
Englehart	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	15	14	7,400
Espanola	Espanola General Hospital	13	4	5,600
Exeter	South Huron and District Memorial Hospital	-	35	3,500
Fergus	Groves Memorial Hospital	26	-	10,400
Fort Erie	Douglas Memorial Hospital	61	-	24,400
Fort Frances	LeVerendrye Hospital	29	70	18,600
Fort William	McKellar General Hospital	181	254	97,800
Galt	Galt General Hospital	72	-	28,800
Galt	South Waterloo Memorial Hospital	-	177	17,700
Geraldton	Little Long Lac Hospital	23	-	9,200
Goderich	Alexandra Marine and General Hospital	30	24	14,400
Grimsby	West Lincoln Memorial Hospital	-	34	3,400
Guelph	Guelph General Hospital	101	146	55,000

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Guelph	St. Joseph's Hospital	97	77	46,500
Haileybury	Misericordia Hospital	58	42	27,400
Haliburton	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	9	-	3,600
Hamilton	Hamilton General Hospital	825	511	381,100
Hamilton	St. Joseph's Hospital	175	304	100,400
Hamilton	St. Peter's Infirmary	112	98	54,600
Hanover	Hanover Memorial Hospital	20		8,000
Hawkesbury	Notre-Dame Hospital	15	-	6,000
Hawk Junction	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	9	-	3,600
Hearst	St. Paul's Hospital	54	-	21,600
Hornepayne	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	6	-	2,400
Huntsville	Huntsville District Memorial Hospital	-	27	2,700
Ingersoll	Alexandra Hospital	-	60	6,000
Iroquois Falls	Anson General Hospital	32	-	12,800
Kenora	Kenora General Hospital	43	14	18,600
Kenora	St. Joseph's Hospital	47	-	18,800
Kilworth	Woodeden Convalescent Hospital	-	40	4,000
Kincardine	Kincardine General	32	-	12,800
Kingston	Hotel Dieu Hospital	229	61	97,700
Kingston	Kingston General Hospital	393	81	165,300
Kingston	St. Mary's-of-the-Lake Hospital	-	115	11,500
Kirkland Lake	Kirkland and District Hospital	105	-	42,000
Kitchener	St. Mary's Hospital	120	-	48,000
Kitchener	Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital	114	347	80,300
Leamington	Leamington and District Memorial Hospital	-	51	5,100
Lindsay	The Ross Memorial Hospital	54	-	21,600
Little Current	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	5	-	2,000

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Listowel	Memorial Hospital	38	-	$ 15,200
Little Current	St. Joseph's General Hospital	21	-	8,400
London	Parkwood Hospital for Incurables	145	50	63,000
London	St. Joseph's Hospital	282	-	112,800
London	St. Mary's Hospital	-	220	22,000
London	Victoria Hospital	432	458	218,600
McKenzie Island	Margaret Cochenour Memorial Hospital	15	-	6,000
Markdale	Centre Grey General Hospital	-	24	2,400
Matheson	Rosedale War Memorial Hospital	9	-	3,600
Mattawa	Mattawa General Hospital	31	-	12,400
Meaford	Meaford General Hospital	-	29	2,900
Midland	St. Andrew's Hospital	42	-	16,800
Mindemoya	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	16	-	6,400
Mount Forest	Louise Marshall Hospital	14	7	6,300
Nakina	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	7	-	2,800
New Liskeard	New Liskeard and District Hospital	-	42	4,200
Newmarket	The York County Hospital	56	-	22,400
Newtonbrook	St. John's Convalescent Hospital	18	170	24,200
Niagara Falls	The Greater Niagara General Hospital	170	-	68,000
Niagara	Niagara Cottage Hospital	-	28	2,800
Nipigon	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	-	22	2,200
North Bay	Queen Victoria Memorial Hospital	-	104	10,400
North Bay	St. Joseph's Hospital	94	27	40,300
Oakville	Oakville-Trafalgar Memorial Hospital	-	46	4,600
Orangeville	Lord Dufferin Hospital	22	75	16,300

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Orillia	Orillia Soldiers' Memorial Hospital	77	41	$ 34,900
Oshawa	Oshawa General Hospital	151	46	65,000
Ottawa	Ottawa Civic Hospital	642	104	267,200
Ottawa	Ottawa General Hospital	186	446	119,000
Ottawa	The Perley Home for Incurables	117	-	46,800
Ottawa	Hospital St. Louis Marie de Montfort	-	220	22,000
Ottawa	St. Vincent Hospital for Incurables	212	420	126,800
Ottawa	The Salvation Army Grace Hospital	30	55	17,500
Owen Sound	General and Marine Hospital	105	-	42,000
Palmerston	Palmerston General Hospital	15	6	6,600
Paris	The Willett Hospital	26	33	13,700
Parry Sound	The Parry Sound General Hospital	28	50	16,200
Parry Sound	St. Joseph's Hospital	30	33	15,300
Pembroke	General Hospital	90	155	51,500
Pembroke	Pembroke Cottage	56	50	27,400
Penetanguishene	General Hospital	18	61	13,300
Perth	The Great War Memorial Hospital of Perth District	49	-	19,600
Perth	Merrywood-on-the-Rideau	-	43	4,300
Peterborough	St. Joseph's Hospital	91	75	43,900
Peterborough	The Peterborough Civic Hospital	-	226	22,600
Petrolia	Charlotte Eleanor Englehart Hospital	34	-	13,600
Picton	Prince Edward County Hospital	26	-	10,400
Port Arthur	St. Joseph's General Hospital	162	36	68,400
Port Arthur	The General Hospital of Port Arthur	99	126	52,200

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Port Colborne	Port Colborne General Hospital	-	82	$ 8,200
Port Hope	The Port Hope Hospital	45	-	18,000
Port Loring	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	-	5	500
Port Perry	Port Perry Community Hospital	-	29	2,900
Rainy River	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	-	14	1,400
Red Lake	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	-	16	1,600
Renfrew	Victoria Hospital	69	35	31,100
Richards Landing	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	10	-	4,000
St. Catharines	Hotel Dieu Hospital	27	127	23,500
St. Catharines	The St. Catharines General Hospital	165	201	86,100
St. Mary's	St. Mary's Memorial Hospital	-	33	3,300
St. Thomas	St. Thomas-Elgin General Hospital	102	309	71,700
Sarnia	Sarnia General Hospital	77	187	49,500
Sarnia	St. Joseph's Hospital	144	-	57,600
Sault Ste. Marie	Plummer Memorial Public Hospital	47	126	31,400
Sault Ste. Marie	The General Hospital	96	88	47,200
Seaforth	Scott Memorial Hospital	9	27	6,300
Simcoe	Norfolk General Hospital	51	66	27,000
Sioux Lookout	Sioux Lookout General Hospital	-	42	4,200
Smith's Falls	St. Francis General Hospital	38	27	17,900
Smith's Falls	Smith's Falls Public Hospital	59	-	23,600
Smooth Rock Falls	Smooth Rock Falls Hospital	-	15	1,500
Southampton	Saugeen Memorial Hospital	-	25	2,500
South Porcupine	Porcupine General Hospital	23	-	9,200
Stratford	Stratford General Hospital	106	188	61,200
Strathroy	The General Hospital	47	3	19,100
Sturgeon Falls	St. Jean de Brebeuf Hospital	42	49	21,700

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Sudbury	St. Joseph's Hospital	216	-	$ 86,400
Sudbury	Sudbury General Hospital	-	253	25,300
Sudbury	Sudbury Memorial Hospital	-	187	18,700
Thessalon	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	14	-	5,600
Tillsonburg	Tillsonburg District Memorial Hospital	-	101	10,100
Timmins	St. Mary's Hospital	103	-	41,200
Toronto	Baycrest Hospital	-	86	8,600
Toronto	Canadian Mothercraft	27	-	10,800
Toronto	Hillcrest Convalescent Hospital	35	-	14,000
Toronto	Lockwood Clinic	48	-	19,200
Toronto	Mount Sinai Hospital	59	-	23,600
Toronto	Our Lady of Mercy Hospital	270	-	108,000
Toronto	St. Joseph's Hospital	250	289	128,900
Toronto	St. Michael's Hospital	586	176	252,000
Toronto	Salvation Army Grace Hospital	52	-	20,800
Toronto	The Home for Incurable Children	34	-	13,600
Toronto	The Hospital for Sick Children	112	632	108,000
Toronto	The New Mount Sinai Hospital	-	351	35,100
Toronto	The Northwestern General Hospital	-	105	10,500
Toronto	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital for Incurables	319	197	147,300
Toronto	The Runnymede Hospital	129	-	51,600
Toronto	Toronto East General and Orthopaedic Hospital	210	181	102,100
Toronto	Toronto General Hospital	-	1451	145,100
Toronto	Toronto Western Hospital	550	191	239,100
Toronto	Women's College Hospital	150	159	75,900
Trenton	Trenton Memorial Hospital	-	79	7,900

	HOSPITAL	BEDS AT $400	BEDS AT $100	AMOUNT
Walkerton	County of Bruce General Hospital	35	-	$ 14,000
Welland	Welland County General Hospital	122	3	49,100
Weston	Humber Memorial Hospital	-	54	5,400
Whitney	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	4	-	1,600
Wiarton	Bruce Peninsula and District Memorial Hospital	-	22	2,200
Wilberforce	Red Cross Outpost Hospital	2	-	800
Winchester	Winchester and District Memorial Hospital	-	34	3,400
Windsor	East Windsor Hospital	238	132	108,400
Windsor	Hotel Dieu of St. Joseph's Hospital	209	191	102,700
Windsor	Metropolitan General Hospital	110	176	61,600
Windsor	Salvation Army Grace Hospital	181	-	72,400
Wingham	Wingham General Hospital	13	24	7,600
Woodstock	Woodstock General Hospital	86	-	34,400
Redditt	Red Cross Car	3	-	1,200

2. SUMMARY OF TAX REDUCTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

The Corporations Tax Act

Legislation will be introduced to amend provisions of The Corporations Tax Act affecting special payments with respect to past services of employees made by corporations to pension funds. During the war, The Federal Income Tax Act was amended to allow deductions of these special payments from the income of corporations, provided that such payments did not exceed 10 per cent in any one year of the total amount necessary to be paid into the fund to make it actuarially sound. The Corporations Tax Act was not amended in this regard until 1950 and, at that time, the amendment provided for the deduction of such of these amounts as had not been allowed in 1949 and prior years to be spread over the years 1950 to 1954. At the end of 1954, had the Province remained in the corporations tax field, all companies subject to tax by Ontario would by that time be in exactly the same position as regards special pension payments as they would be under the federal Income Tax Act.

Under the Canada-Ontario Tax Rental Agreement, the imposition of tax on income of companies under The Corporations Tax Act is suspended for the years 1952 to 1956. Those companies affected by the 1950 amendment therefore stand to lose three-fifths of the deductions that were intended to be granted by the 1950 amendment. The legislation to be introduced at this session provides for the deductions to be made from income of fiscal years of companies ending in 1947 to 1951, rather than in 1950 to 1954. This amendment will bring the total deductions into line with similar deductions under The Income Tax Act (Canada).

The Corporations and Income Taxes Suspension Act

When this Act was enacted at the autumn session, it had the effect of relieving all corporations taxable under The Corporations Tax Act of capital and special taxes and also of the 7 per cent tax on income earned after January 1st, 1952. Most of such corporations became subject on the same data to an additional rate on income of 4.4 per cent under

The Income Tax Act (Canada). The result is that by reason of the Canada-Ontario Tax Rental Agreement having been made and the adjustment of rates under The Income Tax Act (Canada), corporations transacting business in Ontario achieved a net saving of 2.6 per cent on Ontario income and the total of the capital and special taxes.

The Corporations and Income Taxes Suspension Act will be amended at this session so that corporations will not be required to file returns under The Corporations Tax Act for the term of the Tax Rental Agreement unless in the meantime the Lieutenant-Governor in Council requires such filing to be recommenced. For budgetary purposes, it may be necessary during some part of the term of the Tax Rental Agreement to require corporations to file returns that will contain sufficient information for the Treasurer to know what taxes it may be necessary to levy at the close of the term thereof.

The Succession Duty Act

Where an estate having an aggregate value of less than $50,000 goes to preferred beneficiaries, the present Act exempts such beneficiaries from duty but where the aggregate value exceeds $50,000 but does not exceed $52,450 and it goes to preferred beneficiaries, the amount of duty at present rates exceeds the excess of the aggregate value of the estate over $50,000. An amendment to The Succession Duty Act will be introduced so that the amount of such excess otherwise payable by preferred beneficiaries will not be payable and this reduction in the tax will be made applicable in a proportionate manner when the estate is divided between preferred and other classes of beneficiaries.

The two further amendments to The Succession Duty Act will be introduced.

1. Property passing to a charitable organization that carries on its work solely in Ontario is now exempt from duty. The amendment will provide that, even though such an organization makes contributions to religious or educational bodies that carry on their work on a Canada-wide basis, it will be deemed

still to be a charitable organization carrying on its work solely in Ontario and therefore exempt from duty on property passing to it.

2. Where the will of a deceased has provided for his dependents differently than is ordered under The Dependents Relief Act, certain confusion has arisen out of recent judgments. It will now be provided that duty under the Act will apply as if the deceased had provided for his dependents exactly as in an order under The Dependents Relief Act.

The Race Tracks Tax Act

During the 1952 racing season, the rate of pari-mutuel tax in force added to the percentage of the amount staked permitted by the Criminal Code to be retained by race tracks totalled 17 per cent, as follows:

Total Amount Staked or Deposited on Each Race	Provincial Tax Percentage	Percentage Retained by Each Track	Total
On the first $20,000 or part thereof	8%	9%	17%
On the next $10,000 or part thereof	9%	8%	17%
On the next $10,000 or part thereof	10%	7%	17%
On the next $10,000 or part thereof	11%	6%	17%
In Excess of $50,000	12%	5%	17%

During 1952, the Canadian Criminal Code was amended to permit race tracks to retain a straight 9 per cent of the amount wagered regardless of the amount staked or deposited on each race. The rate of pari-mutuel tax for 1953 is therefore being reduced to a straight 8 per cent of the total amount staked or deposited on each race regardless of the size of such amount, thus retaining the total charge against the pool of 17 per cent.

The Mortgage Tax Act

A bill was introduced in the Legislative Assembly on February 25 to repeal this act effective January 1, 1954. The effective date for repeal of this tax will now be April 1, 1953 and we will reimburse the three municipalities concerned for any loss in revenue during the remainder

of 1953. The Mortgage Tax Act authorizes municipalities having a population of more than 200,000 to pass by-laws providing for the levy of a tax not exceeding one-tenth of 1 per cent upon the amount of money required by any mortgage or charge registered in a Registry or Land Titles Office. In other words, the mortgage tax equals $1 per $1,000 of mortgage.

Only three municipalities in the Province have taken advantage of this legislation, namely, the City of Toronto, the County of York and the City of Hamilton. The Act's original purpose was to reimburse the City of Toronto for the capital cost of constructing a new Registry Office. This purpose has now been served. The City of Toronto has more than recovered its capital outlay for the registry office and in view of the regressive nature of the tax and the substantial increase in payments which will be made to municipalities in 1954 under the new grants system that has been introduced, the Government believes that this tax on the mortgages of home owners should be repealed without delay. The Government will reimburse the three municipalities concerned for the revenue they would have collected from this tax between April 1 and December 31, 1953, and then in 1954 the new unconditional grants come into force which will provide greatly increased revenues.

3. ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES BY THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, FISCAL YEARS ENDING MARCH 31, 1951 TO 1954
(thousands of dollars)

	1951	1952	1953	1954
Grants for Education	43,695	48,863	55,453	59,415
Grants for Hospitals	10,146	11,741	13,903	13,073
Grants for Health Units, School Medical Inspections and School Dental Services	527	580	659	697
Grants for Roads	21,346	25,231	30,200	29,500
Grants under the Police Act	1,669	1,894	2,314	2,480
Grants under the Fire Department Act	1,589	1,721	2,061	2,200
Grants for Day Nurseries	198	218	290	300
Grants for Children's Aid	1,017	1,152	1,348	1,430
Grants for Homes for the Aged	1,038	2,238	2,065	3,000
Grants to assist in the Erection of Housing Units for Elderly Persons	-	-	-	100
Grants for Unemployment Relief	2,687	3,038	3,000	2,850
Grants for Community Centres	425	428	209	225
Grants for Conservation, Drainage Aid and Flood Control	600	1,367	1,769	2,375
Grants for Mining Municipalities	302	373	1,500	1,500
Payments in Lieu of Certain Municipal Taxes	-	-	500	750
Railway Tax Distribution	220	219	250	250
Miscellaneous Grants	937	668	945	1,014
Total	86,396	99,731	116,466	121,159
Special Grants to Hospitals for Capital Purposes	-	5,750	8,500	-
GRAND TOTAL	86,396	105,481	124,966	121,159

4. PROVINCIAL DEBT

Statement Showing Investment Thereof as at March 31, 1952

Funded Debt -		
Stock and Debentures Outstanding	$794,499,500.00	
Less - Sinking Funds	125,126,000.00	
	$669,373,500.00	
6% Bonds of the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway Company due July 1, 1961 - Principal Liability assumed by the Province	900,000.00	
Total Funded Debt		$670,273,500.00
Unfunded Debt		
Savings Office Deposits	58,501,686.53	
Special Funds, etc	24,435,242.39	
Temporary Loans - Treasury Bills	38,000,000.00	
Housing Corporation Limited - Liabilities	12,906,974.11	
The Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation - Liabilities	10,037,597.38	
Miscellaneous	5,000.00	
		143,886,500.41
Accounts Payable and Accrued Interest		12,068,265.76
Gross Debt		$826,228,266.17
Investment Thereof -		
Revenue Producing and Realizable Assets -		
Hydro Electric Power Commission Advances	$165,691,522.25	
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission - Advances	30,207,934.92	
Housing Corporation Limited - Investments	13,485,824.58	
Loans - Farm, Municipal, etc.	13,317,430.63	
Accounts Receivable	10,201,669.78	
Cash on Hand and in Banks	28,589,738.10	
The Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation - Investments	10,099,342.33	$271,593,462.59
Revenue Producing but not Realizable Assets -		
Roads and Highways	$509,669,720.45	
Niagara Parks Commission (Surplus of Assets)	2,446,023.50	
Government of Canada - Debt Account ...	2,848,289.52	
Government of Canada - Common School Fund	1,422,725.76	
		$516,386,759.23
Total Revenue Producing Assets		$787,980,221.82
Non-Revenue Producing Assets -		
Public Buildings, Public Works, etc....	$196,928,992.20	
Equipment, Stores and Materials	5,499,023.50	
Other Loans and Advances	768,241.29	
		203,196,256.99
Other Assets -		
Discount on Debentures, etc. (Less amount amortized		5,740,148.96
Total Assets		$996,916,627.77
Surplus and Reserves - represented in above Assets		$170,688,361.60

5. GROSS PROVINCIAL DEBT

Statement Showing Increase

For Fiscal Year Ended March 31, 1952

	1951 $ c.	1952 $ c.	Increase 1952 over 1951 $ c.
Funded Debt	582,717,500.00	670,273,500.00	87,556,000.00
Unfunded Debt	104,734,611.34	143,886,500.41	39,151,889.07
Income Liabilities	10,511,312.88	12,068,265.76	1,556,952.88
	697,963,424.22	826,228,266.17	128,264,841.95

Accounting for Increase in Gross Debt -		
Capital Disbursements -		
Disbursements on Highways, Public Buildings, Works, etc.....	$.71,054,456.47	
Less Capital Receipts	3,376,526.90	
	$ 67,677,929.57	
Advance to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario - Secured by Bonds	100,000,000.00	
Increase in Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation Investments	9,171,076.96	
Discount on Debentures, issued during year	4,143,500.00	
Increase in Drainage Loans (net) ..	206,926.33	
Increase in Co-operative Marketing Loans (net)	181,766.00	
Increase in Income Liabilities	1,556,952.88	
Increase in Cash	912,293.50	
		$183,850,445.24
Deduct -		
Provision Charged to Ordinary Expenditure - Sinking Fund Instalments	$ 34,276,000.00	
Surplus on Ordinary Account	1,061,438.91	
	$ 35,337,438.91	
Sale - Consolidated Revenue Fund Surplus Investment	10,000,000.00	
Discount on Debentures, written off or assumed	3,898,394.46	
Net Repayments on Loans Receivable		
Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario ... $1,732,499.88		
Agricultural Development Board 1,625,000.00		
Miscellaneous ( ) (net) 298,848.38	3,656,348.26	
Decrease in Sundry Assets of Saving Office	93.20	
Increase in Reserves (net)	1,249,264.35	
Decrease in Housing Corporation Investments	1,444,064.11	
		55,585,603.29
Net Increase		$128,264,841.95

6. NET PROVINCIAL DEBT

Statement Showing Increase

For Fiscal Year Ended March 31, 1952

	1951 $ c.	1952 $ c.	Increase 1952 over 1951 $ c.
Gross Debt.....	697,963,424.22	826,228,266.17	128,264,841.95
Revenue Producing and Realizable Assets	176,413,259.84	271,593,463.59	95,180,202.75
Net Debt	521,550,164.38	554,634,803.58	33,084,639.20

Accounting for Increase in Net Debt -		
Capital Disbursements -		
Disbursements on Highways, Public Buildings, Works, etc.	$ 71,054,456.47	
Less Capital Receipts	3,376,526.90	
	$ 67,677,929.57	
Discount on Debentures, issued during year (net)	4,143,500.00	
Decrease in Accrued Interest on Agricultural Development Board Debentures	110,216.39	
Increase in Income Liabilities	1,556,952.88	
Decrease in Income Accounts Receivable	98,598.18	
		$ 73,587,197.02
Deduct -		
Provision Charged to Ordinary Expenditure -		
Sinking Fund Instalments	$ 34,276,000.00	
Surplus on Ordinary Account	1,061,438.91	
	$ 35,337,438.91	
Discount on Debentures, written off or assumed	3,898,394.46	
Increase in Reserves (net)	1,249,264.35	
Net Repayments in respect to Other Loans and Advances	16,568.52	
Miscellaneous Decreases	891.58	
		$ 40,502,557.82
Net Increase.....		$ 33,084,639.20

B. ECONOMIC TRENDS AND INDICES

1. POPULATION

Since 1939, Ontario's population has grown by 28.5 per cent, rising from 3,708,000 to 4,766,000 in 1952. Over this same period the number of live births rose from 64,100 to an all time high of 124,600 in 1952, an increase of 60,500 or 94.4 per cent. The natural increase (births less deaths) stood at 26,600 in 1939, rose to 67,200 in 1947 and climbed to a record 80,300 in 1952.

Ontario's birth rate per 1,000 population rose from 17.3 in 1939 to a high of 26.1 in 1947 and, after a moderate decline, again equalled the previous high of 26.1 in 1952. Ontario's natural increase rate has followed a pattern similar to that of the birth rate. In 1939, Ontario's rate of natural increase was 7.2 per thousand population. By 1943 it had reached 10.2 and in 1947 rose to 16.1. In the next two years the rate of natural increase declined, but in 1950 it took an upswing and in 1952 established a new high of 16.9.

In 1952, Ontario's birth registrations were 5.2 per cent above those of a year ago; Quebec's registered an increase of 3.5 per cent and Canada's 3.9 per cent. Ontario's natural increase totalled over 80,000, about 9,500 more than the previous year high in 1951. Both the rates of births and natural increase approximated the highest level this Province has experienced since 1900.

ONTARIO'S POPULATION, BIRTHS, DEATHS AND NATURAL INCREASE, 1939-1952 (1)

Year	Population 000's	Births	Birth Rate Per 1,000 Population	Deaths	Natural Increase	Natural Increase Rate Per 1,000 Population
1939	3,708	64,123	17.3	37,530	26,593	7.2
1940	3,747	68,524	18.3	38,503	30,021	8.0
1941	3,788	72,262	19.1	39,226	33,036	8.7
1942	3,884	78,192	20.1	39,119	39,073	10.1
1943	3,915	81,173	20.7	41,063	40,110	10.2
1944	3,963	78,090	19.7	39,781	38,309	9.7
1945	4,000	78,974	19.7	39,499	39,475	9.9
1946	4,093	97,446	23.8	39,758	57,688	14.1
1947	4,176	108,853	26.1	41,619	67,234	16.1
1948	4,275	104,195	24.4	42,364	61,831	14.5
1949	4,378	106,601	24.3	43,379	63,222	14.4
1950	4,471	108,708	24.3	43,948	64,760	14.5
1951	4,598	114,824	25.0	43,981	70,843	15.4
1952	4,766	124,620	26.1	44,302	80,318	16.9

(1) Population figures are taken from D.B.S. Memorandum, July, 1952 and Ontario Annual Report, December, 1949 and D.B.S. monthly reports, Births, Marriages, and Deaths in Canada, 1952.

2. IMMIGRANT ARRIVALS, ONTARIO AND CANADA (1)

The cessation of hostilities in 1945 signalled a revival in the flow of immigration to Canada. Immigration rose rapidly, until, in 1948 over 125,400 persons entered the country, with 61,621 of this number settling in Ontario. For the next two years the tide of immigration receded, and then in 1951 surged upward to establish a post war peak of 194,000 immigrants who entered Canada. Of this total 105,000 gave Ontario as their destination. The level of immigration in 1951 can only be compared with that in the years immediately preceding the First World War, and in particular, with 1913-14, when 120,497 immigrants entered Ontario, although only a portion of them stayed.

In 1952, the number of immigrants to Canada dropped to 164,500, a decline of 15.4 per cent from the previous year, but excepting 1951 it is the highest year on record since 1929 when a total of 165,000 immigrants entered the country. Although overall immigration to Canada in 1952 was below that of the previous year, the number entering from the United Kingdom and the United States rose by 36.0 per cent and 20.4 per cent respectively. Immigration from Northern European and other countries, which together accounted for 68.4 per cent of the total immigration to Canada, fell by 13.2 per cent and 39.9 per cent respectively. A total of 86,059 or 52.3 per cent of all immigrants to Canada in 1952, gave Ontario as their destination. During the period 1946-1952, Ontario received over 405,000 immigrants or 51.4 per cent of the total for Canada.

	CANADA				Immigrants	
	Immigrants from				Giving Ontario	Ontario
Calendar Year	U.K.	U.S.	Other Countries	Total	as their Destination	% Canada
1939	3,098	5,654	8,242	16,994	5,957	35.1
1945	10,853	6,394	5,475	22,722	9,342	41.1
1946	50,984	11,474	9,261	71,719	29,604	41.3
1947	35,957	9,444	18,726	64,127	35,543	55.4
1948	43,724	7,393	74,297	125,414	61,621	49.1
1949	22,201	7,744	65,272	95,217	48,607	51.0
1950	13,427	7,799	52,686	73,912	39,041	52.8
1951	31,370	7,732	155,289	194,391	104,842	53.9
1952	42,675	9,306	112,517	164,498	86,059	52.3

(1) Immigration 1939-1947, Canada Year Book, 1950, p.186; 1948-1952, Statements issued by The Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Ottawa.

3. HOUSING STARTS, COMPLETIONS AND CARRY-OVERS IN ONTARIO (1)

Since 1945, over 216,000 new housing units and conversions have been completed in Ontario, while in the last five years the Province has completed 148,342 new housing units representing 36.4 per cent of the volume of all new housing construction in Canada. The number of new housing units completed during 1952 was down from that of the previous year in both Ontario and Canada as a whole, but the number of starts made on new housing construction in the Province during 1952 was substantially higher than for a year ago. Similarly, the carry-over of 20,513 new housing units under construction at the year's end was significantly higher than was the case in December, 1951.

Year		Starts	Completions			Carry-Over
			New Units	Conversions	Total	
1945	Total	N.A.	13,100	2,000	15,100	N.A.
1946	Total	N.A.	19,600	1,700	21,300	12,706
1947	Total	N.A.	22,500	2,200	24,700	17,243
1948	Total	29,976	26,391	2,273	28,664	21,112
	Urban ..	21,547	18,207			16,382
	Rural ..	8,429	8,184			4,730
1949	Total	34,023	31,440	1,264	32,704	23,585
	Urban ..	23,107	23,144			16,270
	Rural ..	10,916	8,296			7,315
1950	Total	33,430	31,318	1,178	32,496	24,331
	Urban ..	28,428	24,267			19,740
	Rural ..	5,002	7,051			4,591
1951	Total	27,349	31,732	973	32,705	19,258
	Urban ..	21,680	26,530			13,159
	Rural ..	5,669	5,202			6,099
1952	Total	30,016	27,461	985	28,446	20,513
	Urban ..	24,723	22,601			15,713
	Rural ..	5,293	4,860			4,800
Total 1945 to 1952 inclusive					216,115	

(1) Data of the number of dwelling units completed in Canada during 1945, 1946 and 1947 are based on returns received by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics from 623 municipalities out of a total of 3,845. These 623 municipalities had approximately 66 per cent of the total population of incorporated municipalities. The number of dwelling units completed as reported in these returns is increased by an estimate of the probable completions in municipalities from which returns were not received. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics only provides figures by provinces in these years of the actual completions reported. As this method leads to an obvious understatement of the completions in the provinces, the number of completions in Ontario for the years 1945 to 1947 has been increased above the actual number reported by the same ratio as the estimates for Canada have been increased above the actual number reported. Completion of dwelling units in Ontario during the years 1948 to 1952 have been estimated by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics from the results of a nation-wide survey carried out each month by the Bureau with the co-operation of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

4. PERSONAL INCOME IN ONTARIO AND CANADA (1)

Since 1939, personal income in Ontario has climbed from $1.8 billion to $3.8 billion in 1946 and to an estimated $6.7 billion in 1952. This represents an overall increase for the Province of 279 per cent or more than $4.9 billion. Over the same period personal income in Canada rose from $4.3 billion to $17.1 billion.

Ontario's share of the Canadian personal income reached a high of 42.8 per cent in 1941 and then gradually dropped to a low of 38.6 per cent in post war 1948. Since then, Ontario's share of the nation's personal income has risen to 39.2 per cent.

Year	Ontario	Canada	Ontario as % of Canada
	(millions of dollars)		
1939	1,766	4,320	40.9
1940	2,059	4,947	41.6
1941	2,522	5,896	42.8
1942	3,002	7,475	40.2
1943	3,367	8,176	41.2
1944	3,566	9,002	39.6
1945	3,729	9,239	40.4
1946	3,821	9,761	39.1
1947	4,068	10,390	39.2
1948	4,608	11,943	38.6
1949	4,953	12,757	38.8
1950	5,313	13,483	39.4
1951	6,182	15,852	39.0
1952	6,700(2)	17,146	39.2

(1) National Accounts, Income and Expenditure 1926-1950, p.62, and Preliminary 1952, p.11.

(2) Estimated.

5. WAGES, SALARIES AND SUPPLEMENTARY LABOUR INCOME (1)

Wages, salaries and supplementary labour income established a new peak in 1952. In Ontario, wages and salaries rose to an estimated $4.7 billion, an increase of 13.2 per cent over 1951 and more than four times the $1.1 billion of 1939.

On a per capita basis, wages and salaries continue to remain on a substantially higher level in Ontario than in Canada as a whole. In 1952, estimated wages and salaries amounted to $986 for every person in the Province compared with $752 for Canada.

Year	Ontario		Canada		Ontario as % Canada
	Amount (millions of dollars)	Per Capita $	Amount (millions of dollars)	Per Capita $	
1939	1,092	295	2,575	229	42.4
1946	2,189	535	5,323	433	41.1
1947	2,584	619	6,221	496	41.5
1948	3,010	704	7,170	559	42.0
1949	3,246	741	7,761	577	41.8
1950	3,500	783	8,324	607	42.0
1951	4,153	903	9,732	695	42.7
1952	4,700	986	10,855	752	43.3

(1) Dominion Bureau of Statistics, National Accounts, Income and Expenditure, 1926-1950 and 1952 (preliminary).

(2) Estimated.

6. NET INCOME OF AGRICULTURE AND OTHER UNINCORPORATED BUSINESS(1)

Net income of agriculture and other unincorporated business in Ontario as for all of Canada, registered a decline in 1952 as compared with the previo year. The decline for Canada amounted to $290 million or 8 per cent below the record $3,742 million established in 1951. The drop in Canadian farm net income is attributed in large part to a sharp decline in livestock prices of between 20 and 25 per cent, and a 10 per cent rise in farm operating costs. The outbreak of foot and mouth disease and the decline in livestock prices prior to, and after the United States embargo, resulted in a large drop in receipts from sales of livestock and also in a lower valuation of additions to livestock inventories. Canada's record wheat crop of 688 million bushels was of high quality and initial prices remained unchanged from those of previous years, but these factors were insufficient to offset the declines experience in other income items.

Ontario's farm cash income in 1952 at $725.3 million was below that of the previous year, but still $47 million higher than in 1950. The value of Ontario's principal field crops totalled $340 million, of which hay accounted for $91 million, oats $55 million and mixed grains $46 million. The tobacco crop of 127 million pounds worth $53 million from a planted area of 83,703 acres was the result of the highest average yield per acre on record in Ontario

Net income of other unincorporated business in Ontario registered an improvement over the level of a year ago, and thereby aided in establishing Ontario's total net farm and other unincorporated business income at $1,100 million. In 1952 Ontario's share of the total Canadian net income derived from agriculture and other unincorporated business approximated 31.9 per cent.

Year	Ontario (millions of dollars)	Canada	Ontario as % Canada
1939	306	899	34.0
1946	732	2,161	33.9
1947	789	2,350	33.6
1948	932	2,953	31.6
1949	966	2,969	32.5
1950	1,008	2,899	34.8
1951	1,194	3,742	31.9
1952	1,100(2)	3,452	31.9

(1) Dominion Bureau of Statistics, National Accounts, Income and Expenditure, 1926-1950 and 1952 (preliminary). Net income of agriculture excludes undistributed earnings of the Canadian Wheat Board and an inventory valuation adjustment for grain in Wheat Board channels, on a calendar year basis.

(2) Estimated.

7. COMBINED PRIVATE AND PUBLIC CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO AND CANADA

Since 1940, Canada's combined private and public capital investment (excluding repair and maintenance expenditures) has totalled $32.4 billi The current level of new capital investment in construction, machinery and e ment at $5 billion is nearly 5 times that of 1940 and 4 times that of 1945. In 1940, Canada's new capital investment amounted to 15.3 per cent of the Gr National Product, but this proportion dropped gradually during the War years until a low of 10.8 per cent was registered in 1945. Thereafter, the proport rose rapidly until in 1952 new capital investment represented 21.8 per cent o the nation's Gross Product.

Capital investment in Ontario has followed a pattern similar to that for Canada, rising from less than $400 million in 1940 to $2 billion in 1952. Since 1940, the sum of $12.4 billion of capital has been invested in th Province's industrial plant, machinery and equipment, housing, highways and buildings, representing over 38 per cent of the Canadian total. Over the last five years Ontario's annual capital investment has been from 49 to 73 per ce greater than that of any other province.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO AND CANADA
1940 - 1952(1)
(millions of dollars)

Year	Canada	Ontario	Ontario % Canada	Canada's G. N. P.	Capital Investment in Canada as % of G. N. P.
1940	1,048			6,872	15.3
1941	1,463			8,517	17.2
1942	1,542	2,739(2)		10,539	14.6
1943	1,485			11,183	13.3
1944	1,309			11,954	11.0
1945	1,284			11,850	10.8
1946	1,703	2,048(2)	37.4	12,026	14.2
1947	2,489			13,768	18.1
1948	3,175	1,183	37.3	15,613	20.3
1949	3,502	1,297	37.1	16,462	21.3
1950	3,815	1,419	37.2	18,217	20.9
1951	4,581	1,748	38.2	21,448	21.4
1952	5,003	1,965	39.3	22,984	21.8
TOTAL	32,399	12,399			

(1) Capital investment data for Canada and Ontario have been taken from publications of the Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, for years 1948 and 1949, Private and Public Investment in Canada, 1926-1951, p. 201, and for years 1950, 1951 and 1952, Private and Public Investment in Canada, Outlook 1952, p. 17.

(2) Estimated.

The following table provides a breakdown of capital investment by industry in Ontario for the years 1950, 1951 and 1952:

8. CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO, BY INDUSTRY(1)

Industry	1950	1951	1952
	(millions of dollars)		
Primary Industry and Construction Industry	197.3	228.8	228.5
Manufacturing	217.9	385.2	507.5
Utilities	314.7	358.3	408.2
Trade, Finance and Commercial Services	166.6	180.2	134.5
Residential Housing	317.9	341.1	343.8
Institutional Services and Direct Government	204.8	254.0	342.5
GRAND TOTAL	1,419.2	1,747.6	1,965.0

(1) Private and Public Investment in Canada, Outlook 1951, p. 23 and Outlook 1952, p. 22.

9. ESTIMATE OF PROVINCIAL-MUNICIPAL CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO, 1949-50 to 1952-53

(Does not include expenditures or grants for repairs and maintenance)

	FISCAL YEARS OR NEAREST CALENDAR YEARS(1)			
	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53
	(thousands of dollars)			
1. Direct Capital Expenditures of the Ontario Government				
Highways	32,314	36,001	48,525	67,960
Public Works	6,921	8,971	9,890	13,950
Hydro-Rural Power Extensions	10,622	7,297	10,224	9,800
Resources Development(2)	11,100	12,500	13,200	13,700
Education(3)	627	623	704	1,080
Grants to Hospitals and Sanatoria	2,561	2,083	9,170	13,153
Grants for Community Centres	475	425	428	209
Grants for New Homes for the Aged	196	652	1,566	1,200
Housing Development	961	407	94	3,816
Miscellaneous	1,220	1,140	2,300	2,170
Sub Total	66,997	70,099	96,101	127,038
2. Provincial Commissions, etc.				
Ontario Hydro	150,116	171,480	164,618	150,705
Ontario Northland Railway	894	3,444	4,020	4,499
University of Toronto	2,366	1,772	1,041	1,450
Niagara Parks Commission	249	440	148	80
Sub Total	153,625	177,136	169,827	156,734
3. Municipalities(4)				
Schools	22,000	36,000	38,200	45,600
Hospitals	11,300	5,300	8,200	17,700
Water	11,500	8,200	28,100	14,700
Hydro	2,900	1,200	12,000	6,100
Sewers	8,000	12,900	12,800	17,000
Drains	1,300	1,400	6,100	1,600
Pavement, sidewalks, bridges, and road machinery	7,300	9,700	12,400	17,700
Local Improvements	3,000	3,800	1,200	800
Civic Buildings	5,500	1,500	1,100	1,200
Housing	400	400	1,900	1,900
Capital Expenditures out of Revenue	4,300	3,900	4,000	4,700
Toronto Transportation Commission	9,548	13,520	17,656	21,930
Other	10,500	9,300	13,700	10,000
Sub Total	97,548	107,120	157,356	160,930
Total of Items 1 to 3 (Less Rural Power Bonus)	307,548	347,058	413,060	434,902

(1) Capital expenditures of Ontario Government departments and Niagara Parks Commission are for fiscal years and all others are for calendar years with the exception of Hydro for 1949-50 and 1950-51. In 1950 Hydro changed its fiscal year end from October 31 to December 31 with result that the amounts shown for 1949-50 and 1950-51 are for the fisc. years ended October 31, 1949 and December 31, 1950 respectively, with the latter period being fourteen months in duration.

(2) Includes the Departments of Lands and Forests, Mines and Planning and Development.

(3) Includes expenditures of the Department of Education on Normal Schools Schools for Blind and Deaf, etc., and provincial grants for capital purposes to Vocational Schools.

(4) Municipal expenditures, with the exception of those shown for schools, capital expenditures out of revenue and the Toronto Transportation Commission are 1948, 1949, 1950 and 1951 debenture approvals of capital undertakings.

10. CURRENT EXPENDITURES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO AND ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT IN CANADA AS A PERCENTAGE OF PERSONAL INCOME, FISCAL YEARS 1938-39 and 1951-52(1)

	1938-39			1951-52		
	Current Expenditures	Personal Income (1938)	Current Expenditures as % Personal Income	Current Expenditures	Personal Income (1951)	Current Expenditures as % Personal Income
	(millions of dollars)		%	(millions of dollars)		%
Ontario Government	86.8	1,689	5.1	287.2	6,182	4.6
Federal Government	413.0	4,090	10.1	3,597.4	15,852	22.7
Provincial Governments	289.2	4,090	7.1	875.2	15,852	5.5
Ontario Municipal Governments	106.6	1,689	6.3	323.2	6,182	5.2
Canadian Municipal Governments	288.8	4,090	7.1	590.6	15,852	3.7

(1) Compiled from the Bank of Canada Statistical Summary, 1946 Supplement, pp. 39 and 43; the Bank of Canada Statistical Summary, October, 1952, p. 170, and December, 1952, p. 220; Public Accounts of Canada, 1952; Comparative Statistics of Public Finance, 1936-1940, Dominion-Provincial Conference, January, 1941, Table 50; Annual Report of Ontario Municipal Statistics, 1951, pp. XXII and 131; and National Accounts, Income and Expenditure Preliminary 1952, p. 11.

11. ESTIMATED TAX COLLECTIONS IN ONTARIO BY THE THREE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT FISCAL YEARS 1938-39 and 1951-52

	1938-39 $ (millions)	% Total Tax Revenue Collections	1951-52 $ (millions)	% Total Tax Revenue Collections
Federal Government Tax Collections in Ontario(1)	188.5	49.8	1,634.3	76.5
Ontario Government Tax Collections(2)	75.0	19.8	275.3	12.9
Ontario Municipal Government Tax Collections(3)	115.0	30.4	226.3	10.6
TOTAL	378.5	100.0	2,135.9	100.0

(1) Any estimate of the Federal Government's tax collections in Ontario must inevitably be approximate. Compilations of the Federal Government's direct taxes, such as corporation and personal income tax and succession duties, are based on the figures published in the report of The Department of National Revenue, "Taxation Statistics". Federal collections of indirect taxes, such as sales and excise taxes, are estimated on the basis of the ratio of retail sales in Ontario to those in Canada.

(2) Includes taxes such as those on corporations, gasoline and motor vehicle licenses, mining royalties and liquor profits and licenses.

(3) Compiled from Annual Reports of Municipal Statistics of Ontario.

HON. MR. FROST: Order No. 21.

METROPOLITAN AREA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 21, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 80, "An Act to provide for the Federation of the Municipalities in the Toronto Metropolitan Area for certain Financial and Other Purposes" -- Mr. Frost (Victoria).

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South) Mr. Speaker, before making a few remarks regarding Bill No. 80, I wish to refer to an editorial which appeared in the Globe & Mail last Thursday morning. This editorial attacked the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) and myself, for not having taken part in the debate on this Bill. I cannot see that the editor of the Globe & Mail had any right whatsoever to dictate to either the hon. Leader of the Opposition or myself as to when or how we should enter the debate. The editorial attempted to give the impression that the debate was over at that time, that the only member of the Opposition who saw fit to rise and take part in the debate was the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

For myself, I felt that after the hon. Ministers had made their presentations in regard to the different sections of the Bill, covering their departments, and the hon. members representing Toronto ridings and those of the surrounding area, in this Legislature, had taken part in the discussion, we would be free if we wished -- and those of us who come from some distance -- to make our observations. I felt it was of more interest to the local hon. members, and, therefore, they should be given the preference in addressing their remarks to

the House. That is why I have delayed saying anything on the Bill, and I resent very much the imputations contained in the Globe & Mail. I wondered, Mr. Speaker, if someone had not rapped the editor of the Globe & Mail across the fingers and he was taken a backhanded slap at the hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself when he made his observation.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very comprehensive, one of the most sweeping Bills we have had before us. It means a great deal to Toronto and the surrounding areas, and even to the province at large. The day may come when similar measures may have to be introduced in connection with other municipalities, and I think we should give this Bill all due consideration.

As for amalgamation and annexation; my Party believes we may have to use these measures elsewhere at some time. I am not one of those who say that the powers under the Act should never be used. I think the authority to amalgamte or to annex is one which can be used to good advantage in connection with many municipalities.

I would like to give the House some references particuarly in connection with northern Ontario. About six years ago, my home municipality decided we should annex six adjacent townships.

(TAKE E FOLLOWS)

As some of the members may know, the townships in Northern Ontario are very small, six miles square, and our township has been organized since 1919. Surrounding it were several other townships unorganized. We saw a certain amount of mining development in these other townships, and we thought that a situation would spring up somewhat similar to that existing at Sudbury . The City of Sudbury, as you know, has mines around its perimeter, not located in the city, and this was quite a difficulty in that municipality some years ago.

At that time we felt that the organization of the six surrounding municipalities in with our municipality, or to annex them, was the proper procedure and we proceeded to do so. That is an illustration of annexation, the township of Calvert, an organized municipality, taking in six unorganized townships; that is annexation.

As an illustration of amalgamation there was an area south of our municipality which decided to set up township organization. In this area there was no organized township but eight or nine townships went together and set up a township organization. That was an amalgamation of eight or nine townships into one municipality.

Both of those municipalities are doing well and I can tell the House very freely that we have done a good job in annexation and amalgamation. In fact some of the other townships surrounding our

township have asked us in the past couple of years for permission to come in, that is some of the residents of the unorganized townships have expressed hope that we would in time take them in and let them become part of our municipality.

You can see the difference between a six-mile-square township and six or eight townships all in one. The cost of administration is at least much less than if each one had to set up an organization of its own.

I rather like the comparison given by the member for St.David (Mr. Weaver) yesterday afternoon when he was talking about the situation here in Toronto. He referred to the mother hen with her chicks around her. He made a good comparison in that connection but perhaps he did not like to carry the comparison as I may be free to do so. I would like to point out that when those chicks were newly hatched and not able to support themselves, they were very pleased indeed to be able to cuddle up to the warm body of the mother hen and hide underneath her wing.

These municipalities drew their comfort and support from the Mother City of Toronto. As time went on they grew in size and occupied a greater space in the nest and there was crowding, and that is the situation we have today, that of the municipalities and the old mother hen are crowding each other, and that is the plan of this Bill, to

cure that situation. I agree that amalgamation or annexation is the proper procedure to take in the case of this kind, but I do not agree wholly with the plan set out in this Bill.

I might also say to these municipalities that the day will come when the deep-water seaway goes through, when a lot more trade and commerce will come to Toronto. Why not have the whole area enjoying all the benefits and the increased trade and commerce which the deep-water seaway will bring, and if they are all combined in one single unit then they all share in the profits and advantages.

At the risk of bringing down on my head the condemnation of the member for Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay) I am going to uphold what I have heard said here in the House and that is that I think the Fire Department and the Police Department should have been two of the first services to be brought under the Act, and to come under the control of the Metropolitan Council. Surely those two services are of such importance that we should now co-ordinate them at the very beginning. They are services which I cannot see should be divided amongst the different municipalities. Why should we have jurisdiction disputes, The Fire Departments of one municipality can only go so far, the Fire Brigades can only go up to a certain street so why not have an over-all Fire Brigade and an over-all Police Department and consolidate them in the whole area?

The suggestion has been made that the type of Metroplitan Council being set up here is somewhat similar to the County Council. We in Northern Ontario have not a County Council set up, and I hope that we never do. I am not in agreement with the County Council. I think it is an obsolete type of government which was all right at one time in the horse-and-buggy days when it took a considerable length of time to travel from place to place. It was all right to have a county set-up at that time but my idea now is the larger municipal area on the township basis, and then direct contact with the Government. I am sure that some of the departments of the Government will agree, especially the Department of Highways and the Department of Municipal Affairs will agree with the idea. I think the day will come when the County Council system passes away.

As regards the plebiscite: considerable argument was brought forward by the member for St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg) as to the taking away of democratic rights by not permitting a vote on this question. I cannot agree with that. I cannot see how a referendum or a plebiscite would decide anything. For instance, suppose in holding a vote for the whole area with all the people of the thirteen municipalities voting on one question, it would affect a portion over here to the west in a different manner than it would affect the portion to the east.

You cannot decide a referendum in that manner. A referendum must be taken by submitting to the people some questions that affect them in the same manner over the whole area, therefore he states that a referendum or a plebiscite would solve this matter is not correct and I cannot agree with it.

Some others would say that perhaps we should take a vote in the different component municipalites. Well, why should the vote in one of the smaller municipalities having a population of eight or ten thousand people have the same weight as a vote in a municipality having a hundred and twenty thousand people? Take for instance Toronto; Toronto might be entitled to one vote or one decision either for or against amalgamation. If that were correct, why say to the Wards each Ward should have the right to a separate vote, each of the nine Wards would have the right to a separate vote, one War might have a different view on this subject than another Ward. Therefore I cannot see that a referendum or a plebiscite would solve anything in connection with this Bill.

There is one question I would like to have clarified and that is: What is the status of the twelve municipalities as regards liquor privileges or liquor licences? I presume that they will not be interfered with, but I would like to have an assurance from the Prime Minister.

HON. MR. FROST: I would like to give my

hon. friend opposite assurance that there is nothing in the Metropolitan Bill which will affect the position of the municipalities in this area, or any part of the municipalities. In the City of Toronto, for instance, at the present time certain portions of the city are dry by reason of old annexation. In some cases there are municipalities in the outlying areas that have certain types of licences. Those will be completely undisturbed and nothing will affect them whatever.

MR. GRUMMETT: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister make that statement.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: This would be a good time to clear up the question of these annexations. Some people imagine if they annex to a city large enough to change the status of hotels and cocktail bars, that is all they have to do, but that does count because an annexed area has to take a separate vote.

MR. GRUMMETT: Before it changes its status?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Yes, they cannot be drawn in.

MR. GRUMMETT: That is only proper. As I said at the beginning the plan proposes certain things, and I would like to outline those points.

First of all I think the Bill should have a clear and definite statement that this plan of an Area Council or an overriding Council is temporary only. I have listened to the members from Toronto

speaking and while they will not definitely commit themselves, they seemed to me to express the hope that the day will come when there will be amalgamation.

Now if that is the thinking and the desire of the members of Toronto, why not put it in the Bill that it is of a temporary nature only? A clear statement should also be given in the Bill as to when the Area Council will pass away and thus become one municipality.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Would it not be safe to leave it to those municipalities to bring recommendations to the Government of what they feel is best in years to come and ask for a change in that Act which could be changed in time.

MR. GRUMMETT: I am not quite so certain that you will ever get all the municipalities and the Area Council agreeing. I am just a little bit afraid that the Area Council, once set up, will want to maintain its establishment and perpetuate itself. It will be a big Council overriding all of the Councils in Toronto and I am afraid that it will not make any effort whatsoever to complete its job and pass out of the picture. So therefore I would like to see something put in the Bill of a definite nature saying just when the Area Council would pass away and complete amalgamation take place.

I think it was the Leader of the Opposition

who spoke about progressive amalgamation. His idea of progressive amalgamation was that the municipalities would say to the mother City of Toronto, "We want to come in, we want to amalgamate". One would amalgamate here and another there, and so on. I cannot see that taking place. What I think would happen is that after several had amalgamated we would find a very small one close to the City of Toronto would refuse to come in. Years might pass by and that one small unit would refuse to go into the amalgamation. It would hold up the development of the whole area by staying out. We want them to come in at the same time and I therefore would like to remark, as the hon. member for St. David said yesterday, that amalgamation should be by progressive steps. I believe he has the correct idea, amalgamation by progressive steps; that is, we set up this Bill as it is and we provide in the Bill that after a year so many services be taken in, two years some more, and three years more, and at the end of five or six years then the whole area will be amalgamated. All the services in the whole area will come under the one Council, and the Area Council can be disbanded or enlarged to become a ward system Council for the whole amalgamated City of Toronto.

Suppose we do not provide in the Bill for these services to be taken in in a progressive way, what is going to happen? Maybe next year

the Area Council will want to take over some other additional services. They will have to come here and present another Bill, and we will have to go through this whole rigmarole and battle again in connection with extending the services. We would have a continual repetition of the debate on this Bill as long as there were any services left to be taken in. But if every year certain additional services were to be taken in there is no question of any dispute. The City and the other municipalities know just when those services are being taken over and there is no coming back here with another Bill year after year to extend the services.

Mr. Speaker, I can look at this Bill from a long distance away, living some distance from the City. I would like to see done for the Area that which is best, and I do not like to see the little petty jealousies of some municipalities holding up progress. There is no doubt about it, this Area has to be one amalgamation Area, and not being tied in with the politics of the City as I know the members of Toronto are, I can say that I hope within a certain period of time, five or six years, that the whole area will be one amalgamated city.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on Bill No. 80, I would like to say that a great

privilege has been conferred upon me to speak for this Bill.

The historic riding of North York at present has something like 100,000 people. I am in the very unique position, Mr. Speaker, of being one of the two members -- the other is the hon. member for York (Mr. Beckett) -- whose ridings are to be severed, cut in two, as it were, and it is in the northern part in which I reside, and I am going to try to recount to you, if I may, some of the difficulties which have brought about this amalgamation and some of the difficulties which have confronted the northern part of my riding.

(F follows)

I would like first to deal with I may with the southern part of the county, and in particular with the municipality of North York and its problems.

The chief difficulties in a growing municipality such as North York have been:

(1) The provision of school facilities

(2) The provision of water

(3) The provision of sewers and sewage disposal plants

(4) The provision of roads.

The population of North York in seven years has quadrupled, jumping from 25,000 to over 100,000, and it now is the thirteenth municipality in Canada measured by population. This tremendous expansion has meant that school facilities have had to be provided practically overnight. In one year, for example, the Township had to build twelve new elementary schools. Because of the impossibility of finding a market for the large debenture issues to provide this accommodation, the approval of plans of subdivision had to be slowed down. There was no other course open to the Municipal Council because homes could not be erected unless school facilities could be provided. Not only was the cost of erecting schools a factor but the maintenance of these schools after they had been

erected. While industry has moved in to take part of the load, this movement has not been fast enough to offset the costs involved, and in any event the industries make no immediate contribution to the capital cost of schools, so they still had to be debentured.

Under the provisions of Bill No. 80, the financing of these schools will be a charge over the whole metropolitan area. Presumably it will be easier to sell debentures with the credit of the whole metropolitan area behind them, particularly if the Government adopts a suggestion of guaranteeing the metropolitan debentures issued in the next ten years.

To build a school room costs approximately $1,000 per pupil, and since the average number of children per house in North York is well over one, it means that every house built adds to the Township debenture debt for schools alone upwards of $1,000. When it is remembered that around 5,000 houses were built in 1952, it can be seen what a tremendous addition this means to the Township debenture debt, and it could not continue.

Bill No. 80 will remove this obstacle to progress and will enable more houses to be built, and eventually we should be able to catch up on

demand. People require houses and houses must be provided for them.

A provision of water to homes is a "must". Where is this water to come from in the case of a municipality cut off from a large source such as Lake Ontario? North York has developed deep wells. Careful surveys by one of the outstanding well drilling organizations of North America has shown that there is no prospect of increasing the water supply in North York from deep wells. Lake Ontario is and can be the only source.

It has been suggested that water might be piped down from Lake Simcoe. Engineering studies prove that this is not possible because the flow of water into Lake Simcoe is not large and the taking of water in any material quantity from Lake Simcoe would mean the lake level would be lower and eventually the lake wholly drained. Add to this the engineering difficulties of piping the water uphill and downhill over such a long distance, the only feasible source is from Lake Ontario.

North York has an agreement with the City of Toronto to provide 2,000,000 gallons of water per day, and has also entered into an agreement with the Township of Scarborough for the same amount of water. All this water comes, of course, from Lake Ontario.

Despite these large amounts, the problem is not solved. North York is only now commencing to take the 2,000,000 gallons from Scarborough following the completion of the Scarborough water plant at the end of last year, but despite this there will still be a shortage of water in North York and prohibition of lawn watering, etc. will have to be enforced during the coming summer.

It is imperative that long range plans be developed to provide an adequate supply of water from the lake and this is one of the things that will be the responsibility of the Metropolitan Council, and presumably one of the first things to which they will devote their attention.

Tied up with the provision of water is the provision of sewers and sewage disposal facilities. The effluent from a sewage disposal plant must go somewhere and in the case of North York the only exits available to the Township are the Humber River, the Black Creek and the Don River. A number of sewage disposal plants have been erected at various points on these three streams but the ability to carry away effluent is now taxed practically to capacity. In the summer, for example, probably 50% of the flow in the Don River is sewage effluent and much the same is true of the Humber and the Black Creek.

This is not a good condition. It can be overcome to some extent by the work of the Humber and Don conservation authorities in taking measures to increase the flow of water in these rivers, but that is a long-term project and the results will hardly show in this generation. The immediate solution is to build truck sewers to disposal plants strategically located for the discharge of effluent into Lake Ontario. Since North York has no access to the Lake, it means that such works can be carried out only through and with the consent of other municipalities, and this is a problem which will be overcome by turning over to the Metropolitan Council the responsibility for provision of sewage disposal plants for trunk sewers.

There is tremendous north and south traffic through the Township of North York by persons passing from the City of Toronto to the northern parts of the province. North York, with its 13 miles of width lying across the City of Toronto, must, of course, accept this traffic. There is no other thing to be done. This traffic does not originate in the Township, but nevertheless the Township is faced with the cost of maintaining the roads. Toronto and York Road Commission maintains a number of north-south arteries such as Bayview, Bathurst, Dufferin, Jane and the Woodbridge-Weston Road. However, the Roads Commission provides

a pavement only 22 feet wide, which is hopelessly inadequate for the volume of traffic. Therefore the Township is being forced at its own expense to widen these arteries, and a start was made last year on the widening of Bathurst Street north from Forest Hill Village.

Over and above this through traffic, there is a heavy daily traffic to and from the City of Toronto. While the City may say that provision of roads is the responsibility of the Township and that they are used in the main by Township residents, this is not strictly true, as without adequate roads the commerce of Toronto would be severely impaired because the people of North York are spending a very large part of their purchasing power in the City of Toronto, and the stores, factories bread companies, dairies, etc. of Toronto are making their deliveries in North York. Also the industry and commerce of Toronto could not continue at its present level without the huge purchasing power and without the huge labour pool of an area such as North York. Therefore the provision of main arteries is very clearly an area responsibility and this again is one of the problems which will be solved by the passing of Bill No. 80.

The Planning Board of the Township has

laid out such through arterial roads as the Spadina Road extension. However, lacking the finances to implement the construction of these roads little has been done except to draw lines on a map and acquire some of the necessary property. The Metropolitan Council should be able to commence immediately the construction of such through roads and alleviate the tremendous traffic congestion. One has only to look at the north and south roads between five and six o'clock in the evening to realize that here is an urgent problem which must be solved immediately.

The problems of North York have been inherited from the past and created by the tremendous expansion. Before the passing of the Planning and Development Act in 1946, there was little or no control of subdivisions and subdividers were not required to provide subdivision roads. It has been a tremendous task to try to catch up on this necessary work and at the same time keep pace with the expansion.

The formation of the Metropolitan Council will relieve the municipality of some of these major area problems and will allow them to devote more time, attention and money to the solution of purely domestic problems such as the provision of

these subdivision roads and the installation of an adequate system of storm drains.

In passing I would like to pay tribute to those who have served during these past few years on municipal councils and school boards, especially those of North York, for the great interest they have shown in their devotion to duty and the sacrifices which they have made personally to guide their Township through the tremendous difficulties with which they have been confronted. Too much can not be said to their credit.

One further aspect of Bill No. 80 of which I am greatly in favour is the provision made for the Metropolitan Council to take over certain arterial roads into the heart of the City of Toronto. Any one who has travelled these roads during rush hours knows the conditions which exist there and their impassibility.

I would now like to deal with the northern portion of the country which is to be cut off from the Metropolitan Area. I might say that there is deep concern on the part of the new county which is to be formed as to their ability to still carry on these roads which must be maintained in a very high state of efficiency, and I do feel, and I think I am voicing the sentiments

of the people of the new county as a whole, that we are all very grateful indeed for the provision in Bill No. 80 which provides the taking over as a Provincial highway the present suburban road which will lead from the new Toronto by-pass going through Scarborough, Markham, Whitchurch, Sutton and Georgina to Port Bolster.

It is a satisfaction to know that the Toronto Suburban and County of York Road System will become part of the new Suburban Road System receiving the same assistance as was formerly granted to the Toronto and York Road System.

I might say that there was a great feeling of concern over the new county's ability to carry this system as I do not need to point out that with a population of 1,500,000 on their southern border, 90% of our traffic will be to and from this metropolitan area, and that perhaps there may be still a little doubt in the minds of the people of their ability to assume the cost of the present set-up as there will be practically 90% of assessment cut off from the northern portion of the country by the new arrangement. The proposed Metropolitan Area has contributed between 85% - 90% of the road cost since the Toronto and York Roads Commission was inaugurated.

The proposed legislation, in spite of making all the present county roads in the county of York suburban roads, still leaves the county of York with a burden of 25% of the cost, which should be reduced considerably.

Other things of major concern are the distribution of costs of administration of justice, Children's Aid the Home for the Aged and the disposition to be made of the new county park consisting of approximately 500 acres of land which lies in the northern part of the county along Lake Simcoe. There is also a county forest of approximately 3,000 acres of land which will have to be adjusted as well.

I might point out that I was pleased to see in Bill No. 80 that provision had been made whereby the Metropolitan Council could go outside their area for the purchase and maintenance of further parks and perhaps other things.

Although I do not feel that this Bill is perfect, yet as time goes by there will no doubt be amendments to it to iron out the kinks, and from my own experience of having served in the York County Council, I have every confidence that the new Metropolitan Council will be able to function in a very efficient manner indeed.

In passing, may I say we have had practically a small County Council in the conference of Toronto and York members, where we have got along very well indeed and which I can assure hon. members has been an inspiration to me.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am voicing the sentiments of the northern portion of the county in saying that it is with regret that they are now being severed from the southern part of the county as there was always a great bond of pride and affection between them ever since the men of York stormed up the heights of Queenston with Brock.

Thank you.

--- Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. W. J. STEWART (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that this Bill has been discussed at length, both inside and outside this House. May I say to the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Fishleigh) that I thoroughly enjoyed his sense of humour in dealing with his election campaign. Speaking of the capsules which he used for advertising, I am sure he will agree that Bill No. 80 is no small capsule.

Never before in my experience in this House has any Bill been given the time, study, consideration and analysis which have been given by the Toronto and York hon. members in connection with this Bill now before us. There has been talk a-plenty inside the House and talk a-plenty outside the House. Shakespeare had the same experience, Mr. Speaker, in his day because he wrote: "What a spendthrift he is of his tongue."

In the Scriptures it is written: "Can any good thing come our of Nazareth?"

. . . . . I wonder, can any good thing come from anyone other than themselves? To the minds of some, can any good thing come from Queen's Park?

Mr. Speaker, the question, "What do you think of the Cumming Report?" has been frequently asked.

After twenty-seven lawyers had ninety days of hearings, and a Board of trained minds taking eighteen months to study the representations, it is a bit difficult to understand how a few hours after the report is released, we find persons giving lengthy opinions, dividing into two camps and making voluminous reports, one group for and another group against. To my mind, it is something I cannot quickly say I am for or against it; I reserve the same right to take the time to study the report as they took to prepare it.

When one is asked: "Are you for it or against it?" it recalls the story of a man in Police Court who was asked, "Have you stopped beating your wife? Answer yes or no."

Nowadays the question is: "Are you for or against Bill 80?" Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe Toronto made an application for amalgamation which was refused, and the Chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board, Mr. Cumming, and his Board drafted what they believed to be a chart and a compass or a skeleton structure which we might be able to fill in. While I cannot agree with all the features of that Report, I would like to pay tribute to the devotion to duty displayed by those officials.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs

(Mr. Dunbar), in his eloquent address, used these words:

> "Many governments investigated but for one reason or another no seriously constructive solution has been presented prior to the report made by the Ontario Municipal Board in January, dealing with the Toronto amalgamation application."

He also stated:

> "No one who had any proposal to offer was denied an opportunity to be heard."

Mr. Speaker, having served as an alderman in the City of Toronto for seven years and four terms as Mayor, and later entering this House in 1938, I think I may modestly say I have some little appreciation of the problem before the Board, and before this House today.

At the outset of my remarks I would like to pay tribute to the Toronto City Council as constituted from year to year, and the Council of every municipality concerned, as well as to their officials, both civic and provincial. Down through the years their services have revealed honesty of purpose, ability and integrity, and I have no hesitation in saying that Toronto's very favourable and enviable position of today is due in abundant measure to the splendid officials which Toronto has been fortunate enough to employ.

Mr. Speaker, unwarranted criticism has been levelled by a Toronto Controller against the Toronto members in this House, criticising them for not speaking up for Toronto. My answer is that that statement is pure nonsense. It remainds me of a story of Disraeli. A young member went to his chief one day and said: "I demand the right to speak on this Bill. If I do not my constituents will be wondering why I didn't." Disraeli replied, "It would be much better to have them wondering why you did not than why you did." I think there is something to be learned from that.

I have been greatly impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the interest displayed by every Toronto hon. member and by the three hon. members for York. A number of Toronto and York members have been meeting daily, endeavouring to study the Report. They even met on a Saturday, which stands in contrast bold to the Controllers' charge that they were not speaking up for or looking after Toronto.

That reminds me of the old proverb: "All wind and no rain." What constructive suggestion have we received from some of our critics?

Mr. Speaker, I know every hon. member would have me pay unlimited tribute to our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), who has given freely and

gladly of his time in conference with any who desired to obtain information. I have enjoyed the privilege of conferring with top level officials, and I have found everyone to be most co-operative. To my mind they reveal an abundance of knowledge in trying to explain, enlighten and assist, and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this in the hearing of every hon. member and the public at large. Never at any time has the hon. Prime Minister nor any of his hon. Ministers endeavoured to enlist my support for the Bill.

(G-1 follows)

Rather, from time to time they have invited my criticism and asked others for their opinions. Every brief which has been sent to me and to other hon. members from the City and organizations have been very carefully studied, and I may say we received some splendid constructive suggestions from the various briefs. I feel sure that when we reach Committee stage on this Bill several amendments will be introduced as to the detailed measures.

I have never in my experience in this House been confronted with any measure or any Bill that has caused me more concern, and, I have learned, that has been the experience of my colleagues. What brings this condition about? Mr. Speaker, we have had an abnormal growth in our population in this area, and the division of authority among the many Councils, each acting on their own best judgment having regard to local conditions. Lack of concurrent jurisdiction and boundary handicaps have brought about the present-day conditions of confusion and near chaos.

From time to time, to remedy City conditions we have received Bills which we might term palliative treatment, which have produced absolutely no cure for civic ills, but have merely been a temporary remedy.

Today we find that a very malignant condition exists, and consultations have been held and the best brains in Government Service has advised a major operation. Benign complacency is dangerous. No one welcomes the verdict of their doctor or surgeon that they must have an operation, particularly a major operation, but are we to take our experts' advice? This requires a major operation. The existing problems have been cumulative. In the dark days of the 1930's, when I had the high privilege and honour of serving my City as Mayor, we had around 35,000 families on relief, and there was no desire on the part of the City of Toronto then to consider annexation or reaching out to take others in to add to the burden of relief. However, today present conditions stand in contrast to the conditions existing at that time.

The question before us is: "Are we going to consent to the major operation or take the chances?" I have been frequently asked "Why not amalgamation?"

Then from another group comes the question: Why amalgamation? Many reasons have been advanced to the Board as to why, and they are mainly because of the four essential services -- water, sewage facilities, transportation and educational accommodation that the rapid growth demands. I was

always taught in municipal life to provide good water and proper sewage disposal; they were considered the first charge on every municipality.

Transportation to my mind is a very necessary service for workers who have to travel to and from their place of employment. Back in the 20's when a Metropolitan Bill was advanced, what happened? A campaign of fear was carried on, fear of a zone streetcar fare; the people thought they were going to have more than one zone in the City of Toronto, and would have to pay two or three streetcar fares to get home; but nothing happened. I, for one, today register a most emphatic protest against a possibility of any zone fare, making it necessary for any of my people to pay a double fare to get home, and so does every other hon. member. We do not want zone fares.

Then we had the days of depression, going on to recovery, and then the Second World War, and today we have prosperity. In present-day conditions it is time for us to expect to accept some responsibility. We can freely admit today that with the prosperity we are enjoying we have developed an attitude of complacency towards our problems. Everything is going too smoothly.

We have an application now for a remedy;

we are told our streets must be widened and extended to carry the traffic; we are told that our good neighbours need water. Septic tanks located on the same lot as a well are a menace to health, not only to the community but to all their neighbours, including ourselves. There cannot be a menace to health in an adjoining municipality which we can escape here. If you happen to be living on the wrong side of the street within the boundaries of this municipality, you cannot go to the school across the street, and you find there may be plenty of accommodation near where you live, but you find you must send your children on staggered hours to an overcrowded school. Here we have people suffering in the midst of plenty.

We are told that the City of Toronto collects millions of dollars in business tax, and they can say to us: "We get the industries; you find the places for our workers to live, but you pay for the services and build the schools, and we will take the tax." That cannot be said to be"a good neighbour" policy. While we find many people earning their living in the City of Toronto, they are forced to live outside the City and contribute to the taxes to provide for services and build schools where there is no industrial assessment.

Present day events may be likened to the days of Confederation. Then it was a question of unification, and today we have a question of unification, amalgamation or confederation or any other type of municipal union. This was investigated as early as 1924 by the Council of the County of York. In 1932 the Ontario Government of that day appointed a Committee, with the Hon. Mr. Finlayson as Chairman, and Mr. H. E. Beckett, Q.C., as Secretary, to study and report on a proposed confederation of the City of Toronto and the suburban areas.

In 1938, the Government of that day set up the Metropolitan Are Committee. The purpose of that Committee was to investigate and report on certain problems in the municipal administration of what may be termed the Metropolitan Area surrounding the City of Toronto. When the Committee was about ready to present their report the then Minister of Municipal Affairs disbanded the Committee on October 12, 1939. In his letter disbanding the Committee, he said:

> "It does not appear to me opportune that your Committee should make a report setting forth its views and recommendations upon conditions as they now exist, when it is apparent that conditions may be greatly varied and changed as the war progresses."

There was another committee organized in 1950 composed of the mayors and reeves of the thirteen municipalities. It, too, was created to study the problems of the Greater Toronto Area.

The studies and subsequent findings of this committee lead to the City of Toronto making application to the Ontario Municipal Board to amalgamate the thirteen municipalities into a new municipality.

It should be borne in mind that when this application was made the Board had on file an application from the Town of Mimico for unification of services in the Greater Toronto area.

In 1950 the Ontario Municipal Board heard the evidence of all the area municipalities and any other persons who desired to place facts before the Board. After a thorough study of the problems as presented to the Board, the Board published their decision and recommendations in January of this year.

When this application to the Board was made in 1950 only a few of the municipalities (other than Toronto) had reached their limit of expansion, while today there are only three of the municipalities which have space of any consequence in which to subdivide and provide land for new industrial purposes and subdivisions for the construction of new homes.

In order to provide more homes for the people the municipalities must supply services such as water and sewers, roads and schools. The fact that ten of the thirteen municipalities have used all their available land for the construction of homes places a serious responsibility on the remaining three municipalities to find land for the ever-growing population of the thirteen municipalities.

A municipality which cannot grow, supply land for industrial purposes at reasonable cost, and supply land at reasonable cost on which industrial workers can build homes, is bound to go backwards.

Therefore, to make land available for industry and for homes in the Toronto Area, it is necessary to create a new form of municipal government which will be able to provide the four essential services which will permit the whole thirteen municiaplities to grow into the greatest Metropolitan Area in the Dominion.

Bill 80 provides for the financing of the construction of schools, the production of water, the disposal of sewage and the construction and maintenance of arterial roads.

While the provisions of this Bill at the

present time seem to benefit only a few of the municipalities, over a period of years it will benefit every municipality in the area, because if no provision is made for further development every area in the municipality will suffer.

> "There is a destiny which makes us brothers;
> None goes his way alone.
> All that we send into the lives of others
> Comes back into our own."

Industry will be forced to go elsewhere in Ontario to establish their plants, either because there is not sufficient serviced land available or there are not suffieient homes in the area for the industrial workers.

The population of Toronto and the thirteen suburban areas, taken in 1952, showed:

Toronto	667,364
Remaining 12 suburban areas	466,789
Total	1,134,153

A forecast of the population for 1956 is estimated as:

Toronto	670,000
Remaining 12 suburban areas	667,400
Total	1,337,400

You will note from these figures that the population of the area municipalities by 1956 will be about 3,000 less than the population of the City of Toronto. This clearly proves that it will

be only a few years before there are more people living in the Metropolitan Area than in the City of Toronto.

We are also told that many fear higher taxes. Our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) answers that by saying: "Unconditional and per capita grants will lower taxes."

I am a great believer in the policy of "Trust the people", and I would have liked to have seen the whole problem submitted to the people, but as I sit here day after day and struggle for light I become baffled as to how such a momentous question could be placed before the people. In what clear, concise, understandable language could a question be framed and submitted to the people on the unification of services? How can it be said briefly enough for people to readily grasp it?

Mr. Speaker, it resolves itself into three words --"why, when and where?" Why the Bill? I have summed up the situation as a matter of necessity. When is it going to happen? When we admit necessity and deal with the situation. Where? Well, where do we arrive if we do not pass the Bill and where do we get if we do? Is that not the question before us? Why must anything be done? Why do we have Confederation?

The study of The British North America Act on the eve of Confederation must deal largely in terms of separate Provinces and differing regional economies, but it must at least begin with a survey of the problems which were common to all Provinces and the forces which acted impartially upon all economies alike. The burden of these common problems and the pressure of these outside influences were largely responsible for the movement which ended in Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, when Bill 80 becomes law -- if it does become law -- the people's elected representatives, twenty-four in number, will carry on through the organizational period. After that the people will elect by their own ballot every member of that Council. I would say to the County members, I believe the scheme suggested for the organizational period and for administration of the Metropolitan Council is a very high tribute to County Councils, because it recognizes the principle, enlarges upon it, and places it to the forefront. Those of us who feared that some high and mighty Board, sitting in an ivory tower, might be governing the Metropolitan Area have had that fear removed, because if the little man wants something done on his street or in his neighbourhood he may go to his own local alderman

or councillor; he does not have to go to see some person in an ivory tower. The people are still in control of their own local affairs.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), in a very convincing manner, disposed of the issue of civic employees, and certainly conveyed a great deal of comfort to civic employees, by saying that there will be no wholesale displacing of staff and that the established privileges would be transferred with them. Surely that should bring some degree of comfort.

The fear of interference by Councils over Boards of Education has been stated in unmistakable language to be absolutely needless.

I shall deal with the gross debt, and then I am about finished. The gross debt of Toronto is about $104 million or $156 per capita. The gross debt of the area is about $186 million or $164 per capita. Equalized assessment of the greater area of population amounts to $1,400 million, or $2,099 per capita. Equalized assessment of the area, $2,360 million, or $2,081 per capita, or about $8 less than that of Toronto. The debt percentage of equalized assessment for Toronto will be $7.42, and for the area, $7.87, a difference of 45 cents per capita.

From information supplied by the treasurers of the thirteen municipalities, the total debenture date of the Area as of December 31st, 1952, was $186 million, of which $103 million was gross debenture debt of the City of Toronto, which leaves the debenture debt of the local municipalities as $81 million.

I would estimate, Mr. Speaker, that by 1956 or 1957 the debt of the whole area would be evenly distributed between Toronto and the Area municipalities, and at that time the population forecast shows that the population will be about fifty-fifty. The equalized assessment of the twelve suburban municipalities will likely exceed that of Toronto.

(H-1 follows)

Where would we be if we do not pass Bill No. 80? We are told that progress is stopped in highway extentions for quick travel to and from employment, that children will be without schools, there will be an inadequate water supply, poor sewage disposal, and the health of the people in the entire area will be in very great danger. We are told that the industrial expansion will be limited, and it will reduce employment. We are told that increased housing is entirely dependent upon relief, as afforded by Bill No. 80. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that Bill No. 80 will remove technicalities and the legal roadblocks which prevent a housing program being developed, It is said there will be an insufficient water supply, inadequate sewage disposal, children without schools, and traffic congestion will result, and that the employees in industry will be without transportation which would threaten our lives and rob the rising generation of their rights, and which would intensify the traffic hazards.

Time will not permit me to contrast unification with Confederation, but I hope that Bill No. 80 will be as productive of good results, as Confederation.

I have had people come to me and oppose the Bill. I have sat up several nights until midnight

listening to people discussing this Bill. I have obtained their suggestions and have carried them back to my colleagues. I have asked for an alternative plan, which I would be only too happy to submit. Up to date, Mr. Speaker, I have received none.

I must pay a well-merited tribute to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). While I am opposed to amalgamation, I believe the essential services should be resolved by negotiation with the surrounding municipalities. I am aware that the problems are very complex, but I do not agree to forced amalgamation. I believe in the unification of essential services and negotiations. Under the present Bill, these municipalities can expand and progress, and the Bill in no way presents any obstacle to progressive amalgamation. The municipalities need financial aid. This Government, by unconditional grants, is giving them aid, and I believe that taxes will be reduced. I certainly would not vote for the Bill and jeopardize the city of my birth, the city which bestowed the great honour on me by electing me Mayor. Do you think I am going to "sell them short?". One must not be misled by demagogical utterances and verbosity. We are concerned with the welfare of all the people, including the little

people.

This matter is too important, too vital to be used as a vote catching platform for civic preferment. I think I am doing the right thing for the people who honoured me, in going along with this Bill. Do you think I would stand up here and by voting for this Bill, do the city an injustice? I honestly think it is the best thing to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to who will be the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council. Let me put the minds of the hon. members at ease right here. Here is one who is not an applicant and not available. But I have unlimited faith in the hon. Prime Minister of this province, and this Government, and I feel that whoever the hon. Prime Minister names, and the Government appoints, will be a person who, in their opinion, is best qualified to head this Council, and who very definitely will not be a partisan appointment. That is my conviction. I have carefully watched the administration by the hon. Prime Minister, and my feeling is that in his actions he follows the words of a dear friend of mine, a former editor of the Mail & Empire, who has now gone to his reward, Mr. Vernon Knowles, who told me that to every editorial which came to his desk, before it was published, he applied the acid test

of three words, "Is it fair?". I believe those three words form the guiding principle of our hon. Prime Minister.

Bill No. 80, to my mind, has several contentious clauses, and some features which are debatable, but, Mr. Speaker, it is but the general principle which is before us today. The details can be adjusted in Committee, because I think I can safely forecast that in Committee a number of detail changes will be asked for, and more than likely adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I did not enthuse over this Bill at first sight. No one has asked me to support it. No one has offered anything better. I believe that at the next session changes will be sought. To this major operation, I consent. I believe that all hon. members have given every detail serious contemplation and perusal, and to the hon. members in the affected areas, may I say I am sure that all the hon. members for Toronto join me in saying that while their attitude was alert, while they were keen for their ridings, to protect their ridings, they have at all times been most friendly and co-operative.

Mr. Speaker, it is the truth to say our hon. Prime Minister has displayed courage and fore-

sight in bringing down such a major measure for our consideration. After due thought and careful consideration and a great deal of thinking, I will support this Bill on principle because I believe we are laying the foundation for a structure -- yes, a super-structure -- of the greatest city in Canada. I believe in doing so, we will provide for industrial expansion and the ways and means of building homes for our people, and will be doing everything we possibly can to safeguard their health.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the hon. members for Toronto must co-operate, and that we must widen and extend our areas at the base, and unify our services.

Mr. Speaker, to survive, we must expand.

(Page H-6 follows)

---Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. ARTHUR REAUME (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I have not thought about it very much, but I do think that Bill No. 80 will probably pass. May I say in opening that Mr. Cumming and his Board are very, very able men. The Chairman of the Board comes from the city of Windsor, and the training he received there I think was very good, But, in any event, I want to say that I do not believe this was a job for he or his Board, because there is always the feeling amongst the people -- rightly or wrongly -- that the municipal board, as such, comes under the thumb of the Government in power. I am not saying that is true. I do not think it is true. At the outset I submit that what this Government should have done was to appoint an independent, unbiased Board composed of competent people, who would go out and find all the facts about this problem -- and I say it is a big problem. Then, after having found all the facts, this independent Board, one not constantly under pressure, could have brought down a report, and said to the people of the affected areas, "Here is what this is all about; here are the pros and cons; you shall have the opportunity of voting for or against it."

I know that some of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House, Mr. Speaker, will say that in regard to Windsor, four places were joined as one and there was not a vote taken, or there was not a vote ordered, but three out of those four places actually voted; two voted in favour and one was opposed. In the overall vote, there were more people in favour than there were opposed.

Mr. Speaker, this problem of taking essential services I honestly think is a step in the proper direction. I know the problem in Toronto and the surrounding area is much larger than it was in our case in Windsor, but when you speak about "courage" may I say that back in 1934, one of the greatest Prime Ministers who ever occupied that high office in this province, and one of the greatest men who ever sat in a Cabinet in this province, Mr. Mitchell Hepburn, the former Prime Minister, and Mr. David Croll, announced the amalgamation of four very important places. Even then there was a difference, and even then there were some for and some against,

(TAKE I FOLLOWS)

But I want to say in the over-all picture after many, many years, that it has proven to be a good thing. Mr. Speaker, here is what will happen with the Metropolitan Council.

MR. A. H. COWLING (High Park): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member (Mr. Reaume) permit a question?

MR. REAUME: Just a moment.

MR. COWLING: What was the population at the time?

MR. REAUME; Just a moment. Here is what will happen. You will have members appointed on the Council from the various sections, each and everyone fighting for his own rights -- and quite properly so. Consequently, what you will find in turn is that you will have little cliques building up here and there fighting against each other. You will find a joining together of certain people for the purpose of trying to get certain favours for their own area.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that was done in the case of Windsor. The appointment of a commission for the purpose of studying this big important thing for a period of time, until all troubles have been ironed out, is the proper way to go about it, because there is no question about the fact that if the Government of the day pushes this Bill down the throats of the people, they will build a fire around the people of this area that shall go on

burning and smouldering until ---

MR. COWLING: The hon. member (Mr. Reaume) does not know much about the people of Toronto.

MR. REAUME: What the hon. member (Mr. Cowling) says is right and I agree with part of it. But, Mr.Speaker, I think it would have been much better if the Government had started off by amalgamating certain places, starting off in a small way, if you will, and then spreading out until such time as you have embraced all the areas you have in mind.

MR. COWLING: Which places?

MR. REAUME: The Government is going about this thing in a piecemeal way and it is going to encounter trouble, because this Bill is packed full of trouble. If they had taken their time and not employed an agency that had been appointed by the Government, but employed an outside agency independent of anybody and given them the important job of finding out the true facts,it would have been different. I heard an hon; member say today, "If we vote against it where are we going? If we vote for it, where are we going?". There is the evidence of the fact they don't know where they are going.

Before we go, Mr. Speaker, we ought to have a pretty fair idea where we are going. I submit the only way you can find out where you are going is to appoint competent board of commissioners for the purpose of serving as a fact-finding body bringing in a report in order that everybody

concerned might have the opportunity of going into it. With that in mind I do hope the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) will not call for a vote on this matter in a hurry. It might be worth some thought, and I am sure he has heard as I am sure other people have heard, that it is not the job for a Government-appointed board which is constantly under the pressure of the Government to go out and bring in the report as to what ought to happen in any instance. That is a job for an outside Board.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Reaume) one question?

MR. REAUME: Yes.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: As a comparison; when comparing the city of Windsor and Walkerville, was not the city of Windsor in the hands of a Receiver at the time.

At the time the amalgamation went through, when it was forced through by the Government -- you could read the signs, and you know what the people of Walkerville said.

MR. REAUME: What signs is the hon. member talking about?

HON. MR. DUNBAR: About their going into the amalgamation. But when that problem arose there, they were in the Receivers' hands. Is Toronto saying, "We are going to amalgamate them"? No, they do not, and the hon. member would not

if they had not been "broke" at the time. You wanted to get Walkerville's money, that is all you wanted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. REAUME: Now, now. The hon. Minister, (Mr.Dunbar) has been taking some kind of pills again. That is wrong, we never had in mind at any time trying to get anybody's money.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: No, the hon. member (Mr. Reaume) would not.

MR. REAUME: If the hon. member (Mr. Dunbar) knew anything about it, he would not make that kind of statement. I do not want to enter into an argument with him but I may say I have a file here I will be glad to bring to his office early in the morning, and give him all the facts.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: I will be glad to see the hom. member.

MR. REAUME: I will be in your office in the morning.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay hon. members of the House but I am anxious that this Bill reach committee stage on Monday, because I promised the House we would not hurry the committee stage of this Bill, which will be very important.

May I say, sir, to sum up, that we have had a very full debate on this Bill, we had

a very explicit and complete explanation, we have heard in detail I think from every one of the Toronto and York members involved, and I think we have the case before us.

I should like, sir, to say a word about what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) said. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that action was overdue for ten years. That goes back to 1943. May I tell him, action in this case has been overdue for twenty years. I well remember when Judge Cross, the then hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, speaking in this House some fifteen or sixteen years ago on the necessity of action in the Toronto area.

As far as I am concerned, sir, there has been no hurry. When I became the Prime Minister of this Province on the 4th of May, 1949, I soon found that something had to be done and I took action in January 1950. Since that time the action has been progressive up to this day.

My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) raised two points. First, he said there should be an appeal to the people to find out what they thought. Mr. Speaker, if he would refer to the Windsor-Walkerville, Sandwich and East Windsor situation in 1935, he would get his answer. At that time, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has said, the town of Walkerville was the only solvent municipality

of the four concerned. A vote was taken in Walkerville and Walkerville voted against, and yet the government of that day -- the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) mentions the Hon. Mr. Hepburn as the great Premier; I will not enter into that question. At that time the hon. member for Essex North was not supporting Mr. Hepburn, as he knows.

MR. REAUME: But I am happy I changed.

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. member for Essex North at that time was running as a Progressive Conservative candidate in the same riding he represents today.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): You were not progressive then, you were just Conservative.

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends talk about democracy. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver)

in this very House supported a Bill introduced by the then hon. Mr. Croll, running contrary to the wishes of the people of Walkerville.

MR. REAUME: But not of the whole area.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Leader of the Opposition): My hon. friend (Mr. Frost) cannot "get away" with that. He knows very well the over-all vote was in favour of amalgamation.

HON. MR. DUNBAR: Because they were broke.

HON. MR. FROST: I will take the words out of the mouth of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The fact of the matter is. He took the vote in the town of Walkerville and the vote was contrary, and he is the man who shoved the thing down their throats.

MR. OLIVER: Oh no, that is wide of the mark. How does one get a majority in this country?

HON. MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition only asks a vote of the people in this area because he does not know enough to make up his own mind in connection with this problem. That is the only reason. He is politically bankrupt, he does not know,and he wants to take this complicated problem and throw it to the people of this area and create divisions and create troubles and not do what he himself did as hon. member of this House back in 1935.

May I point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that after all political courage pays off. I think the Government of that day was right and the hon. Mr. Croll was right. I think you were right in voting for that Bill but I think you are wrong in opposing this Bill, because you have not the courage to face the facts.

MR. OLIVER: That was different.

(J follows)

In 1937, after doing what they thought was best for the City of Walkerville, the Hepburn Government elected all four of their candidates in that riding, Mr. Croll, Mr. Fletcher, Dr. Trottier and Major Clarke, with all of whom I sat in this House, so political courage at that time "paid off".

MR. SALSBERG: Did the people vote?

HON. MR. FROST: I do not think they voted in that case.

MR. REAUME: I shall explain it to you, if you want me to.

HON. MR. FROST: If you sat in this House a little more often you would know what is going on. This is the first time you have been here this week.

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Oliver) would burn a little midnight oil and study these things, he would find there could be nothing more unfair than progressive amalgamation, which would saddle the City of Toronto with all sorts of difficulties and would be completely unfair.

Just by way of summing up, Mr. Speaker: the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) mentioned the setting up of a Commission. Does the hon. member know there was a Commission back

in 1935, and Mr. Croll threw out all the recommendations of the Commission holus-bolus. The Hepburn Government appointed a Commission which consisted of Dr. Horace Britton, and others, and in the end Mr. Croll, the new Minister of Municipal Affairs, decided he would not follow the report of the Commission at all. The hon. member for Essex North is talking pure nonsense, and he knows it.

MR. REAUME: That is what you think.

HON. MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member if he had been sitting in this House during this past week, he would have heard some very able hon. members, who know something about these problems, speak on this subject.

(Page J-3 follows)

This problem is 20 years old at least. This Government has come to grips with the problem and I think we have advanced the only solution which can conceivably work.

MR. SALSBERG: Toronto Council does not think so. They voted against it.

HON. MR. FROST: I will come to that. I do not want to endeavour to kill a fly with a hammer.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has had a very great advantage in this case. Not only have we had the advantage of three years very intensive study, and the perusal of all the reports before the Municipal Board, but the report of the Municipal Board itself, and above all that, we have the advantage of the most able group of hon. members which has ever represented the Toronto and York ridings in this House.

We have studied this Bill day after day. We have had hon. members studying it, such members as an ex-Mayor of the city of Toronto, and ex-controller of the city of Toronto, three former aldermen of the city of Toronto, now sitting in this House, all of whom support this Bill. We have a former Chairman and member of the Board of Education, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Kerr) presently sitting in this House. In addition to that, we have

a former Warden of the County of York, and we have two Reeves, one of whom spoke this afternoon. We have a solicitor for one of the important municipalities in this area, who has been engaged in all the involvements and intricacies of this area for the past 20 years. The Government has had the support of all these people. The question boils down to this; in this group of hon. members, ex-Mayors, Controllers, and so on, we have some stating frankly in this House they favour amalgamation, an hon. member stated it yesterday or the day before. And there are others. There are hon. members in this House who said they felt that the federation system was a system which would work. Mr. Speaker, I say, after years of study of this question, there is only one answer to the situation, and that is the present Bill. There is no method by which you can have partial amalgamation, except in the form of a unification of services. There is no other way except by taking an area conception.

I agree with the hon. members of this House who suggest that this is a step to amalgamation, and if amalgamation is proven by experience to be the right thing, then this is a substantial step towards it.

On the other hand, we have the hon. member for York West (Mr. Brandon), a former Warden of the

County of York, and for over a dozen years the head of one of these municipalities, saying he is not convinced of that, but that federation is the only way in which it can be done.

And I say with confidence there is only one course to be taken and that is to support the principles of this Bill, based on the experience which has come from those who have been working in their municipalities and who are assisting to evolve good government for this great metropolitan area.

On these grounds, Mr. Speaker, I say that this Bill meets the requirement of both the amalgamationists and the confederationists. The only people it does not suit are some who sit on the opposite side of this Chamber, who do not seem to be able to make up their minds, and are of the "do nothing" type.

MR. OLIVER: Are all the brains on the other side of the House?

HON. MR. FROST: After saying this matter is 20 years too late, they now say, "let us throw this to the people, and ask them what to do about a matter with which they were elected to deal".

I may say, in support of this Bill, -- and I say it with confidence -- that it is the right

thing for the people of this city and for the people of the province.

Motion agreed to on division.

AYES: 69

NAYS: 9

(Page J-7 follows)

YEAS

Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk)
Kelly
Phillips
Dunlop
Mackenzie
Collings
Yaremko
Brandon
Connell
Cowling
Beckett
Macaulay
Parry
Scott
Gemmell
Welsh
Goodfellow
Griesinger
Cecile
Murdoch
McPhee
Robarts
Morrow
Leavine
Elliott
Beech
Downer
Nickle
Hanna
Dunbar
Challies
Porter
Frost (Victoria)
Doucett
Daley
Patrick
Roberts
Pryde
MacOdrum
Stewart
Johnston (Simcoe Centre)
Hall
Robson
Janes
Villeneuve
Cathcart
Allen (Middlesex South)

YEAS

(Continued)

Dent
Edwards
Pringle
Hunt
Wardrope
Fullerton
Myers
Noden
Weaver
Mapledoram
Fishleigh
Johnston (Parry Sound)
Sandercock
Kerr
Whitney
Herbert
Morningstar
Johnstone (Bruce)
Root
Frost (Bracondale)
Child
Ward

NAYS

Nixon
Oliver
Houck
Grummett
Gordon
Chartrand
Manley
Reaume
Salsberg

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will proceed with Bills on the Order Paper, commencing at 2:00 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:22 of the clock,p.m.

- - - - - - - - -

YEAS

(Continued)

Dent
Edwards
Pringle
Hunt
Wardrope
Fullerton
Myers
Noden
Weaver
Mapledoram
Fishleigh
Johnston (Parry Sound)
Sandercock
Kerr
Whitney
Herbert
Morningstar
Johnstone (Bruce)
Root
Frost (Bracondale)
Child
Ward

NAYS

Nixon
Oliver
Houck
Grummett
Gordon
Chartrand
Manley
Reaume
Salsberg

HON. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will proceed with Bills on the Order Paper, commencing at 2:00 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:22 of the clock,p.m.

- - - - - - - - -

FEB 4 1957

JUL 11 1958

[illegible]